THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE
NEW TESTAMENT

THE PSYCHOLOGY

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT

BY

M. SCOTT FLETCHER

M.A. (Sydney), B.Litt. (Oxon.)

Formerly Tutor in Greek Testament in Newington Theological College, Sydney
Interdenominational Lecturer (1908) in New Testament Ethics
in St. Andrew's College, University of Sydney

WITH INTRODUCTION BY

HASTINGS RASHDALL, D.C.L., D.Litt., F.B.A.

Fellow and Lecturer, New College, Oxford; Canon of Hereford

HODDER AND STOUGHTON

LONDON   NEW YORK   TORONTO

INTRODUCTION

THE present work is substantially identical with a dissertation presented by Mr. Scott Fletcher as a qualification for the degree of B.Litt. after two years' study of Theology in the University of Oxford. As one of the Examiners on whose recommendation the degree was granted, I have been asked to write a line or two of introduction, and I have much pleasure in doing so. The dissertation seems to me eminently deserving of publication : it shows wide reading, much thought, and earnest religious feeling. It represents a serious effort to appropriate and utilize all the resources which modern Philosophy, Psychology, and Criticism have placed at the disposal of the theologian for understanding the true and permanent meaning of the New Testament and of Christianity itself. All thoughtful theological students of all schools are now more or less engaged in the task of theological recon-

struction. The author assuredly belongs to that number; and I have no doubt that the present work, which will doubtless be the precursor of more elaborate ones, will be of real assistance to others who are engaged in the same inevitable task—none the less so if it frequently suggests problems which the necessary limits of such an essay do not enable him adequately to work out.

Mr. Scott Fletcher is a man of much experience in the most practical kind of pastoral work, and he is also a serious and open-minded student of Theology. He has found that his theological studies, and such revision of traditional ideas as they have led to, have helped his influence and success as a Christian preacher, even in dealing with individuals and congregations of little education. The present work bears ample witness to the advantages which attend such a combination of active religious work with the scientific study of Theology.

H. RASHDALL.

New College, Oxford.

PREFACE

THE following pages are the result of an attempt to interpret the psychological language and spiritual experiences of the New Testament in terms of modern thought. The bearing of both the terminology and the spiritual processes concerned on the philosophic conception of Personality has been kept in view throughout.

I wish to acknowledge with thanks the help received from the Rev. Dr. Rashdall, of New College, and from the Rev. B. H. Streeter, of Queen's College, who supervised my work in Oxford. To the Rev. Dr. Vernon Bartlet, of Mansfield College, I also owe very much in the way of helpful criticism and suggestion.

<div align="right">M. S. F.</div>

OXFORD.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTORY

CHAPTER I

PART I

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL TERMINOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER II

ix

CHAPTER III

CHAPTER IV

CHAPTER V

PART II

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL EXPERIENCES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER VI

CHAPTER VII

CHAPTER VIII

PART III

COMPARATIVE CONCEPTIONS OF PERSONALITY

CHAPTER XI

CHAPTER XIII

INTRODUCTORY

THE RELATION OF BIBLICAL TO MODERN PSYCHOLOGY

CHAPTER I

Dr. P. T. Forsyth has recently said,
" There is no revealed anthropology or
psychology." * To agree with this dictum
would seem, at first sight, to condemn as
fruitless the examination made in the follow-
ing pages into the meaning and scope of
Biblical psychology. But a little further
reflection will show that whether we restrict
the Christian Revelation to the fact and
process of Redemption alone (as does Dr.
Forsyth), or whether we enlarge the meaning
of the term to include the inspired record and
interpretation of the redemptive process,
we cannot be indifferent to what Scripture
says about man, who is the object of God's
redeeming purpose. And as it is in the
human mind and soul that divine grace

* *Hibbert Journal,* vol. x. No. 1, p. 236.

operates, we shall never understand Scriptural Redemption till we understand the meaning of the Scriptural teaching concerning the mental and spiritual nature of man.

One of the pioneer expositors of Biblical psychology in modern times, Dr. J. T. Beck, writing in 1843 the preface to his *Outlines of Biblical Psychology,* says, " When at work on my Introduction to the *System of Christian Doctrine,* I came to see very clearly that for the scientific student, who wishes to define the first principles of Christian Apologetics in a way that will do justice to the teachings of Scripture, a *Biblical Psychology* is absolutely indispensable."   The need for a clear understanding of Biblical psychology was never greater than at the present time. The progress of the historical criticism of the literature of the Bible has thrown its contents into a new perspective, and given to its teaching about human nature a fresh significance.   The rise of modern scientific psychology, also, has not only awakened a keen interest in the subject of man's spiritual nature, but has furnished the Biblical student with a new instrument of wonderful

precision with which to analyse and seek to understand the Scriptural terms which describe the mental and moral nature of man. Only upon a sound Biblical psychology can there be built a sound Biblical theology. Whatever historical criticism can teach us as to the development of thought within the Bible itself, and whatever light modern science can throw upon the constitution of human nature, should help us to understand better what the Scriptural writers say concerning man.

The older books on Biblical psychology appear defective to a modern student just because they lack this historical view and because they interpret the language of Scripture in the terms of psychological conceptions which have been largely superseded. The mechanical and static view of the Bible, which regarded the quotation of any passage from any portion of it as sufficient " proof " of Scriptural doctrine, has given way to a genetic method of study whereby the growth and development of a truth is traced from its birth to its maturity.

The process of " reading into " the psychological language of Scripture the conceptions

of patristic or mediæval philosophy is now
held to be utterly misleading, and we re-
quire afresh to study the Biblical teaching
about man from the standpoint of the
Biblical writers themselves. The historical
view of the Bible helps us to do this, and
modern psychology comes to our aid in the
understanding of their meaning. It would
be but to repeat the mistakes of the older
expositors of systems of Biblical psychology
to " read into " the terms of Scripture the
ideas of modern philosophy and science.
But the purpose of this book is rather to
arrive at a knowledge of the psychological
conceptions of the New Testament writers,
by an inductive study of their teaching,
looked at from their standpoint, but inter-
preted in terms of present-day psychology.
Hence it is desirable at the outset to ex-
amine and state in outline the relation in
which the Biblical psychology stands to
modern psychology.

1. PSYCHOLOGY AND HISTORY

Psychology may be defined briefly as
" the science of mind," or more fully as " the
science of that which thinks, feels, and wills,

in contrast with physics as the science of that which moves in space and occupies time." * Professor William James accepts the definition of Dr. Ladd that it is "the description and explanation of states of consciousness as such." † It will at once be apparent that Biblical psychology is the description and explanation which the Scriptural writers give of the mental and spiritual constitution of man. It is a historical system of belief or presuppositions which is complete in itself and readily yields to critical examination. It is embodied in a literature which extends over many centuries of Jewish national life, and contains the views of both Hebrew and Christian thinkers concerning man. It doubtless is developed out of prehistoric and primitive reflections; but by the time the first books of the Bible were written, these early ideas had taken more definite shape and were expressed by terms that tended to become relatively fixed.

Within the Bible itself there is evidence that further development of these psycho-

* Höffding, *Outlines of Psychology*, p. 1.
† William James, *Textbook of Psychology*, p. 1.

logical ideas took place. Still, allowing for such development, the Biblical psychology remains a self-contained and fairly consistent system of teaching about man's inner life of consciousness, and affords a good field for the psychologist in search of historical material. If the N.T. is separated from the rest of the Bible, the deposit of psychological ideas can be studied in detail and as a whole with much greater precision. Dr. A. B. Davidson says, " In the N.T. there may be observed an approach towards a more fixed and definite use of terms." *

The N.T. psychology, when compared with that of the Old, shows signs of having been influenced by three factors—Jewish non-canonical literature, Greek philosophy, and Christian experience—which tended to distinguish it from the earlier Biblical ideas. It affords, then, an excellent example of a historical system which found expression within the limits of a single century and is accessible in a carefully preserved literature.

Modern psychology is a science " still in the making." It takes the subjective facts of consciousness as its first study, but it has

* *The Theology of the Old Testament*, p. 184.

to supplement its methods of observation and experiment by considering also the objective facts of mental life seen in animals, children, and savages, and embodied in ancient literature, morals, religion, and art. This is sometimes called objective or socio-logical psychology. Höffding says, " Socio-logical psychology may be divided into many branches of study (child psychology, animal psychology, the psychology of races, of language, of literature, etc.), all of which lead into the great historical system, within which the individual consciousness develops, just as physiological psychology leads ever to the physical system, in virtue of which the mental life shares in the life of the universe." * Just as modern psychology has investigated the psychology of the Egyptians or the sacred books of the East as historical forms of thought, so it inquires into the psychology of the Hebrews em-bodied in the Biblical literature.

The N.T. psychology is of special interest historically to the modern student. It must be remembered that the Gospel preached by Jesus Christ and his apostles stirred the

* Höffding, *op. cit.* p. 26.

ancient world to its depths. The pages of
the N.T. record the earliest effects of that
message. Are those effects in the emotional,
intellectual, and moral lives of people of no
psychological significance as data in trying
to obtain a fuller view of the nature of human
personality ? Into the manifold life of the
ancient world Christianity came producing
violent agitation in the lives of individuals
and nations. New psychic experiences, a
new type of character, new moral and social
activities emerged. By its historical records
or by its casual references to these facts the
N.T. affords us psychological material of the
highest value in understanding human per-
sonality and of the ways it may be modified
or developed under fresh conditions of re-
ligious life.

2. SCIENCE AND RELIGION

Modern psychology looks at man from the
standpoint of natural science. Biblical psy-
chology regards him almost entirely as a
religious being. If this distinction is ob-
served, the two need not come into conflict,
and we shall be free to utilise the results
arrived at by scientific psychology in order

to understand much that would be otherwise obscure in the Bible. At the same time the religious experiences recorded in the Scriptures afford science additional facts for the contribution which it is making to an independent study of the nature of the religious consciousness. It should be recognised at the outset that the Biblical psychology is not scientific in the strict sense of the word. "Even in the New Testament," says Dr. A. B. Davidson, " there is no Biblical psychology in the scientific sense. The New Testament psychology is not meant to be a psychology of the mind as regards its substance or elements, or even its operations, except on a certain side of these operations. The psychology of the New Testament cannot be pursued further back so as to be made strictly a *psychology* or physiology of the mind. It remains a description of the mind or its attitudes ethically and religiously." * The Scriptures deal primarily with man's relationship to God. The main states of consciousness which it considers and describes are those which arise in connection with its teaching about man's origination from God and his communion with God.

* Abridged from *The Theology of the O.T.*, p. 184.

The Biblical psychology is really theocentric. Apart from the conception of the Spirit of God as creating, sustaining, and directly influencing man, the various psychological terms lose their true significance and become the mere vestiges of animistic beliefs, of interest it may be to the anthropologist, but valueless to those who desire to gain through Biblical psychology some truth as to God's continued relationship to man and man's possible fellowship with the Divine. To the religious man the psychological language of Scripture is of the highest importance, for it was fashioned by religious experience and expresses, as no naturalistic system of scientific psychology can ever be expected to do, the influence of God upon the mind of man and the reactions of the soul of man in a spiritual environment.

It must not be hastily assumed, however, that modern scientific psychology is essentially irreligious because it does not speak the language of the Bible. It considers the facts and processes of the human consciousness as they are in themselves. To do its own allotted work, as a special science, it must free itself from all presuppositions,

both of religion and of metaphysics, which
seem to offer a short cut to the solution of
its problems. " At present," says a writer,
who has done more than any other philo-
sopher to bring the theories of psychology
into harmony with the facts of religious
experience, " Psychology is on the material-
istic tack, and ought in the interests of
ultimate success to be allowed full headway
even by those who are certain she will never
fetch the port without putting down the
helm once more." * While intent on study-
ing the " psychical states as such and the
condition of their occurrence," it does not
feel called upon to say whether man has a
soul at all. " To the psychologist the con-
ception of a soul is not helpful," says Dr.
G. F. Stout (*The Groundwork of Psycho-
logy*, p. 8).† And so the subject is handed
over to Metaphysics for its consideration.
In the same way Biology, while investigating
the phenomena of life, does not feel compe-
tent to say what life is ; Chemistry and

* William James, *Textbook of Psychology*, p. 7.

† Cf. Höffding, *Outlines of Psychology*, p. 1 : " Psycho-
logy is as little bound to begin with an explanation of what
mind is, as physics is obliged to begin with an explanation
of what matter is."

Physics show the same diffidence about defining matter and motion ; and Arithmetic, while exclusively occupied with numbers, is not concerned about the ultimate nature of number. All these special sciences pass on to Metaphysics the duty of investigating the ultimate problems that are connected with each and all of them. " The most important task for Metaphysics is that of sifting the ultimate conceptions that are left over by the special sciences." *

The self-denying ordinance by which psychology is willing to let Metaphysics and Religion settle questions which do not legitimately lie within its province must not mislead us, then, into supposing that scientific psychology is necessarily hostile either to Philosophy or Religion. On the contrary, the work done by psychology is patient road-making, whereby Philosophy may have easier access to the mountain-peak of truth from which it can survey experience as a whole in one comprehensive view. If psychology is allowed to do its work thoroughly enough, it may also " prepare the way of the Lord " for the salvation of human souls.

* J. S. Mackenzie, *Outlines of Metaphysics*, p. 11.

Already much has been done by writers like James, Starbuck, and others, who are but the pathfinders in the new subject of religious psychology.   Others will follow, and much solid work may be expected before the last word has been spoken by science as to the nature of the spiritual life and the laws which govern its fullest development.   In the meantime, the religious psychology of the Bible, expressing in its own appropriate way the facts and experiences which marked the spiritual history of the Jewish people and the yet richer experiences that emerged in Christianity, may be expected to supply the classical terms in which the religious psychology of the future will choose to embody the results of its investigations. Already we find words like Conversion, Sanctification, and Faith, which hitherto have been the exclusive possession of Biblical theology, passing into the current language of modern psychology.   But the main terms of Biblical psychology stand strangely alone, in meaning at least, and are often sadly misunderstood amidst the psychological language that has grown up from the days of Aristotle's scientific inquiries to the present

day.   It is time we more fully utilised the analytical keenness and verbal precision of scientific psychology to study afresh the full meaning of the Scriptural terminology.

3.   Terminology—Biblical and Modern

The relation between Biblical and modern psychology is often difficult to determine, owing to their using different sets of terms to denote man's inner life of consciousness. An additional difficulty is created by the fact that, when they use a term in common (*e.g.* " Soul "), that word is often used with widely different meanings.   It is necessary, therefore, as an introduction to what follows, to state and explain the main psychological terms used in modern textbooks, and to see the bearing of these on the terms which occur in the Bible, and especially in the N.T.

Modern psychology, as the science of the " soul " or " mind," considers all possible states of consciousness.   The facts and phenomena of the mental life supply the subject-matter of its research.   It enumerates, describes, classifies, and, if possible, explains all conscious states and processes, and seeks to

determine the conditions (both physical and mental) under which they arise.

Just as botany collects all discoverable forms of plant life, describes their roots, foliage, blossom, and fruit, classifies them, and seeks to know their geographical distribution ; so psychology treats of all sensations, feelings, modes of thought, and acts of will. It seeks to find out the nature of emotion, intellect, memory, imagination, instinct, and volition. It is when the process of the classification has been done that we begin to see the relation in which its terminology stands to the terminology of the Bible. It has already been pointed out that its *subject-matter* is widely different from that of Biblical psychology, in so far as it treats of *all* possible states of human consciousness, whereas the Bible is chiefly concerned with the processes of the religious and moral consciousness. But in studying the classification which scientific psychology makes, we are enabled to see the real significance of the terms used in Biblical psychology.

Modern psychology does not now classify mental phenomena according to the different " faculties " from which they were supposed

to spring; it arranges them in groups according to the element which is most prominent in each conscious state. So that we do not now speak of such and such " faculties " of the mind, as though they each had a separate and independent existence and as though they *caused* the conscious processes attributed to them; we rather speak of such and such " modes of consciousness." And although in popular usage we still use the " faculty " language and speak of " Intellect," " Conscience," or " Will," it should be borne in mind that these are only the names for the different ways in which the one individual consciousness manifests its activity. Each conscious state, as a matter of fact, is highly complex, involving many mental processes, but the distinctive and dominant characteristic of each state gives to it the name by which it can be classified with others in which a like element prevails.

Since the critical investigations of Kant (b. 1724; d. 1804) it has been usual to employ a threefold classification of conscious states. The three ultimate modes of consciousness are now named (according

to the mental element which preponderates in each) Thinking, Feeling, and Willing. They are sometimes called Cognition, Feeling, and Conation.   Under these three heads all the phenomena of the conscious life can be arranged.   It must be remembered that each mental element is not separate and distinct in itself, nor can it operate without the co-operation of the other two. The cognitive element of thought involves some feeling and some amount of willing. The feeling element interacts with thinking and the exercise of will, and the conative activity of willing is impossible without some measure of both thought and feeling. A brief examination of this threefold division will help us to classify and understand the use of other psychological terms.

The *thinking* element of consciousness, when viewed alone, is sometimes spoken of as the " Intellect," or " Mind " (in the narrower sense of the word).   Under thought or cognition are classified all perceptions and memory, all forms of reasoning and imagination.   Its importance for religious psychology is, that by this power men believe, or doubt ; they have intuition or apprehension of truth.

The *feeling* element of consciousness begins in such elementary states as sensations ; it distinguishes between pleasure and pain, comfort and discomfort, and it includes all emotions, such as joy and sorrow, hope and fear, love and hate. " Toothache is a simple elementary feeling, while sorrow and repentance are feelings which involve ideas and memories." * In religion, feeling and the higher emotions occupy a central place, as also in art.

The *willing* element in consciousness, more briefly called " the will," or conation, is the active side of mind. Under this general term are placed all impulses, desires, wishing, striving, and volition. It is the volitional or purposeful quality in human action which lies at the basis of moral character. For both religion and ethics the question of the nature and freedom of the will is of the highest importance.

Behind the threefold activity of thinking, feeling, and willing lies the unity of the ego or self, the subject of these states of consciousness. This self, to whom belong all thoughts, feelings, and volitions, is often

* Höffding, *Psychology*, p. 222.

called the " soul " in philosophical language. When the soul or ego objectifies itself and *knows* that it thinks and feels and wills, it attains self-consciousness, which is the essential characteristic of what is called Personality.

The psychological terminology of the Bible is not analytic, but grew out of man's actual experience of life, and especially out of his religious reflection thereon. It has four main terms to describe the various aspects of man's total life. They are Flesh, Heart, Soul, and Spirit. These all occur in their Hebrew equivalents in the O.T. and in their Greek equivalents in the N.T. as the four outstanding psychological terms.

All these words gather round the idea of Life and express some special relation to it. The *Soul* is the *subject of life*. It is the bearer of the individual life, what is now called the Ego, or Self. *Spirit*, on the other hand, is the *principle of life* generally, and is therefore regarded, when a constituent part of man, as higher than soul and that which makes man akin to God. The *Heart* is the *organ of life*, and the seat of all thinking, feeling, and willing. The *Flesh* is not

merely the body or its material substance. It is *living matter* or the medium of life's manifestation. These words express certain definite psychological ideas, as will appear in the succeeding chapters. In the N.T. some additional terms appear which came into it from Greek thought. What is usually called " Biblical Psychology " is the system of ideas concerning man's conscious life which these terms embody and express. For the elucidation of their meaning the analytical precision of the vocabulary of scientific psychology is very necessary to a modern reader of the Bible.

In the following pages the Biblical psychology of the N.T. will be expounded and interpreted in the light of modern scientific psychology. Then the spiritual experiences recorded in the N.T. will be examined as psychological data of exceptional interest and importance for an understanding of the religious consciousness in general. And finally, the results of our inquiry into the psychological terminology and the psychological experiences of the N.T. will be gathered together in a synthetic study of the Christian personality.

PART I

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL TERMIN-OLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER II

THE SOUL

In approaching the N.T. teaching about
the Soul, we need, first of all, to free our
minds from ideas which we are apt to " read
into " the term. The Greek usage of re-
garding the soul as the highest part of man,
and especially as the seat of reason, has
not been without a marked influence upon
subsequent thought, though it is foreign
to the essentially Biblical meaning. The
modern philosophical use of " soul " as a
convenient word to express the unity and
totality of all our states of consciousness
goes beyond the strictly Scriptural meaning
of the term. The popular idea of the soul,
again, as the divine element in man or the
organ of the religious life, while partially
true, is far from covering the other shades
of meaning which the N.T. writers express
by it. Much confusion of thought arises

out of supposing that all our usually accepted ideas about the soul (whether Greek, philosophic, or religious) are founded upon Scriptural authority. Words have a history as well as individuals or nations. Few words have a longer history than the word "soul." And it is just as foolish to "read into" this term the accumulated ideas of centuries of reflection as to ascribe to a child the mature thought of an adult, or to credit primitive man with the speculative subtleties of a modern thinker.

It is necessary to bear in mind that the N.T. usage is founded upon that of the O.T. The presuppositions of the Old form the starting-point of the teaching of the New. The Hebrew word for " soul " is *nephesh* (נֶפֶשׁ), meaning literally " that which breathes." When the Hebrew Scriptures were translated into the Greek version of the Septuagint about the third century before Christ, the word *psyche* (ψυχή) was used as the equivalent for *nephesh*.

The N.T. writers adopt this word *psyche*, and in using it they express, as a rule, all that the O.T. writers implied in the word *nephesh*. The N.T. meaning of the term

psyche can only be arrived at by a patient study of the passages in which it occurs. The meanings will be found to shade off into one another—a fact recognised by the English translators, who render the Greek word *psyche* sometimes by " life " and sometimes by " soul." But there are more than two distinct meanings conveyed by this word, and so it will be necessary not merely to consider the passages in which the English word " soul " appears, but also those which in the original Greek contain the word *psyche* (ψυχή). An analysis of such passages shows that it is used in four distinct senses, which, however, contain a logical evolution of thought, viz. the soul as embodied human life, as the seat of feeling and desire, as the self, and as the spiritual part of man.

1. THE SOUL AS LIFE

The primary meaning of " life " appears frequently in the N.T. The soul is that in man which lives.

In the O.T. this fundamental idea is made clear in the creation narratives of Genesis. " The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils

the breath of life ; and *man became a living soul* " (Gen. ii. 7). The expression " a living soul " (*nephesh ḥayyah*, נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה) is used elsewhere of animals, *e.g.* " Every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is *life* " (Gen. i. 30), literally, " wherein there is a *living soul*," as in the margin of the Revised Version. In other passages * the expression, *nephesh ḥayyah*, is rendered " *living creature.*" The Hebrew word that is generally translated by " soul " is used for the *life itself* both of animals (Prov. xii. 10) and of men (Exod. xxi. 23).

The primitive ideas which first led the early Hebrews to associate the soul with the bodily life will be considered later on when a comparison is instituted between the Jewish and the Christian conceptions of the human personality. It is almost certain, however, that by the time the N.T. came to be written the earlier and grosser views had dropped away from the word " soul," and Christianity, which came not to destroy but to fulfil, adopted this term into its richer and more spiritual psychological vocabulary.

* Gen. i. 20, 24, ix. 12 ; Ezek. xlvii. 9.

The fundamental idea, then, of the soul as the bearer of what we may call the animal life, or the bodily-sensuous life of man, is implied in many N.T. passages. It is life constituted under present physical conditions ; life embodied in the human organism. This appears in the Gospels frequently. The Greek word ψυχή, usually translated "soul," clearly denotes " life " in the sayings, " They are dead that sought the young child's *life*, ψυχήν " (Matt. ii. 20); " Be not anxious for your *life*, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink. . . . Is not the *life* more than the food ? " (Matt. vi. 25). It is the " life " which the Son of man gives " as a ransom for many " (Matt. xx. 28 ; Mark x. 45). It stands simply for " life " in Mark iii. 4, Luke vi. 9, where we read of Jesus that he asks whether it is lawful on the Sabbath day " to save a *life* or to kill " ? The phrase " to lay down the *life*," meaning " to die," occurs in the Fourth Gospel—the Good Shepherd " layeth down his *life* for the sheep " (John x. 11, 15, 17). Peter is willing to " lay down his *life* " for his Lord (John xiii. 37, 38) ; or a man will lay down his *life* for his friends " (John xv. 13). In Acts

ψυχή is spoken of as *life* hazarded (xv. 26) or held dear (xx. 24). It is life remaining in a seemingly dead person (xx. 10), and may be " lost," as in shipwreck (xxvii. 10, 22). The verb ἐκψύχειν, translated " give up the ghost," and meaning simply " to die," occurs in Acts v. 10, xii. 23. In 1 John iii. 16 we meet again the phrase occurring in the Fourth Gospel, " lay down the life "— an expression peculiar to these two books and furnishing a link of relationship between them. Nowhere in the N.T. (though frequently in the O.T.) is ψυχή used for the life of brutes, except in the Book of Revelation (viii. 9, xii. 11, xvi. 3). Paul makes little use of the word " soul." It occurs only thirteen times in his writings. In 2 Thess. and Gal. there is no mention of it, nor in the Pastoral Epistles. In common with the other N.T. writers Paul sometimes used it as a bare equivalent for " life." Prisca and Aquila, he says, " for my *life* (ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς μου) laid down their own necks " (Rom. xvi. 4) ; Epaphroditus came nigh unto death " hazarding his life " (Phil. ii. 30). Lifeless things, " whether pipe or harp," are called by him ἄψυχα (1 Cor. xiv. 7).

These numerous instances are sufficient to show how the N.T. frequently retains the word "soul" as the equivalent for "life." Except in the Book of Revelation it means, however, only the life of man as distinct from that of the brutes. The term is never applied to God nor to the angels. So that it is strictly "human life" which is meant when used in this primary sense.

2. THE SOUL AS THE SEAT OF FEELING AND DESIRE

From the primary belief that the soul is the embodied life of man the N.T. usage passes on to a second and closely related idea, viz. that it is also the subject of conscious life. This consciousness, however, is the rudimentary one of feeling and desire. The soul is life coming to consciousness in its appetites, sensibilities, and emotions. This conception of the nature of the soul is derived from the O.T., which attributes to it even hunger (Prov. x. 3) and thirst (Prov. xxv. 25), as well as the higher emotions. In the N.T. the emotional element is the more usual. For example, the great commandment quoted from Deut. vi. 5 says, "Thou

shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy *soul.*" *   The soul is the seat of the feelings of pleasure (Matt. xii. 18), of sorrow (Matt. xxvi. 38 ; Mark xiv. 34 ; Luke ii. 35), of fear (Acts ii. 43), of harmony (Acts xiv. 2), and of desire (Rev. xviii. 14).   In an evil sense it may be stirred up (Acts xiv. 2), invaded by fleshly lusts (1 Pet. ii. 11), and enticed by sin (2 Pet. ii. 14).   Dr. R. H. Charles says, " It is from this conception of the soul that the adjective ($\psi v \chi \iota \kappa \acute{o}s$, E.V. sensual) derived its bad significance in Jas. iii. 15, Jude 19."   Paul occasionally speaks of the soul as the subject of feeling (Eph. vi. 6 ; Phil. i. 27 ; Col. iii. 23 ; 1 Thess. ii. 8).   Being " of one accord," $\sigma \acute{v} v \psi v \chi o \iota$ (Phil. ii. 2), is, as Lightfoot comments, " a complete harmony of the feelings and affections."

These examples are sufficient to show that the writers of the N.T. regarded the soul as the seat of feelings both good and bad. It constitutes the emotional nature of what Paul calls the " natural " (literally " soulish," $\psi v \chi \iota \kappa \acute{o}s$) man.   Linked with the spirit it may rise to the heights of religious fervour,

* Matt. xxii. 37 ; Mark xii. 30 ; Luke x. 27.

expressed in the lyrical ecstasy of the *Magnificat*—" My *soul* doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour " *; but it may burn with the fires of " bitter jealousy " in the life of the " earthly and devilish," † or sink, apart from the spirit's restraining influence, to the depth of sensuality through " ungodly lusts."‡ The soul of Jesus, at the prospect of death, was " troubled " by an unfathomable sorrow ; § the souls of Christians in Jerusalem and Philippi were filled with unutterable peace and love. ‖ In his soul a man experiences every shade of feeling and runs through the whole gamut of the emotions. We express this meaning when we speak of a musician having " soul," or, on the other hand, we say that a dull, callous person is " soulless." To talk of the " soul " of a nation is to refer to its prevailing feelings and sentiments. This is the idea underlying the Biblical conception under consideration. The psychology of the Greeks gives this element a place in the soul

---

* Luke i. 46, 47.   † Jas. iii. 15.
‡ Jude 19.   § John xii. 27.
‖ John xiv. 27 ; Phil. iv. 7.

of man. But Plato * regarded it as the lowest faculty, being merely appetitive and sensational. Nor can it be ranked very high in the Scriptural estimate when regarded apart from the influences of the Spirit. Its chief importance from a philosophical standpoint is, that among the feelings of which man is capable (according to the Bible) arises the feeling of selfhood. This next demands consideration as the third meaning which inheres in the N.T. use of the word "soul."

3. The Soul as the Self

A large number of instances may be quoted from both Testaments to show that the soul often stands for the Self, the Ego, and is only another though meagre way of expressing the idea of the personality of the man. Examples of this usage in the N.T. will be examined later on, but it may be as well to inquire here how this conception could have arisen, and in what relationship it stands to the two already considered. It arose by a natural and logical transition

* *Republic*, bk. iv.

from both the idea of the soul as the bearer
of life and the idea of the soul as the seat of
feeling. Firstly, from the belief that life
dwelt in each soul through the creative
inbreathing of the Spirit of God men came
to think and speak of the soul as the indi-
vidual life. It was that in man which not
only distinguished him from inanimate
things but which separated each man from
all other men. Then the Biblical writers
came to think of it as the subject of that
individual life, and to speak of " the soul "
of a man was only another way of saying
" the person " in whom the life dwelt.
Secondly, it was from the experience of
various appetites, feelings, and emotions that
bare " life " in man became conscious life,
and when man became conscious of himself
as the subject of feeling he expressed that
first dim self-consciousness or rudimentary
idea of personality by the word " soul,"
which already did duty as the name of the
bearer of his individual life. The soul was
that in each man which both lived and felt.
And so in the term " soul " the two streams
united, and it meant henceforth in many
Biblical passages the living, individual, self-

conscious ego, the bearer of what we call the personality. The N.T. use of " soul " for the " self " is easily seen by comparing the saying of Jesus, " What shall a man be profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and forfeit *his life*, or *soul*, ψυχήν ? " (Matt. xvi. 26 ; Mark viii. 36), with the rendering in Luke, " What is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, and lose or forfeit *his own self*, ἑαυτόν ? " (Luke ix. 25). To forfeit one's " soul " is to forfeit one's " self." The expression " I will say to *my soul* " (Luke xii. 19) means " I will say *to myself*." So obvious is this reflexive use in John x. 24 that the translators have rendered it as " How long dost thou hold *us* in suspense ? " whereas it is literally, " How long dost thou hold *our souls* (τὴν ψυχήν) in suspense ? " In enumerations, so many " souls " equals so many " persons," *e.g.* " three thousand souls " (Acts ii. 41, *cf.* five thousand " men," Acts iv. 4), " every soul " for every " person " (Acts iii. 23), " eight souls " for eight " persons " (1 Pet. iii. 20). In Rev. xviii. 13 we have the striking phrase " merchandise of slaves and souls of men."

The Pauline Epistles reflect this usage

also, *e.g.* " Every soul of man that worketh
evil " (Rom. ii. 9) ; " Let every soul be
in subjection " (Rom. xiii. 1) ; " I call God
for a witness upon my soul " (2 Cor. i. 23).
" My soul " equals " me," just as in 2 Cor.
xii. 15 " your soul " equals " you." Dr.
Hort sums up this meaning of the term
" soul " in the following way : " Ψυχή (= נֶפֶשׁ)
is in both Testaments first the individual
being or his or its individual life (Gen. i. 20,
ii. 7), and then by a natural transition what-
ever is felt to belong most essentially to
man's life when his bodily life has come to
be recognised as a secondary thing. It
answers very nearly to our modern word
and conception ' self ' ; and it is curious how
often its force is well brought out by sub-
stituting ' self ' as a paraphrase. . . . It
is the nexus in which all powers find their
unity, that which is at once most individual
and most permanent in us." *

This use of the term " soul " in the N.T.
affords us what may be called the conception
of personality which Christianity took over
from the O.T. and from contemporary Juda-
ism. It lacks, of course, elements which

* Commentary on 1 Peter, p. 134.

an adequate philosophy of personality should contain. Self-consciousness, for instance, which we should consider as central, is only present in the term by implication. But the unity—the selfhood—which underlies all states of consciousness is certainly expressed by " soul." As Christ emphasised the higher aspects of selfhood—of personality —the term " soul " in His teaching and in many of the N.T. writings comes to express that in man which makes him capable of a higher and spiritual life.

4. The Soul as the Bearer of the Spiritual Nature

The last and highest meaning attached to the word " soul " in the N.T. is that it is the bearer of the higher spiritual nature. Just as the idea of the soul as the bearer of the individual conscious life gave rise to the idea of the soul as the self, so this latter prepared the way for a higher conception. There is a lower self, sensuous and animal, but there is a higher self, spiritual and immortal. In the Gospels the effort of Jesus to make men see the importance of the human personality and the worth

of each individual is shown by his insistence
on the higher aspects and possibilities of the
soul. Not that the Saviour overlooked
the needs of man's bodily life. But the
soul as the seat of the animal appetitive
life must be subordinated, lost, or put to
death if the soul as the bearer of the higher
spiritual life is to be gained or saved. Man
is a duality, a unity of body and soul. The
very word which stands for life physical
and spiritual expresses sometimes the one
meaning and sometimes the other. It is
this double meaning underlying the word
psyche which gives point to the otherwise
paradoxical saying of Jesus when setting
forth the condition of true discipleship as
self-renunciation, " Whosoever would save
his life (or soul) shall lose it : and whoso-
ever shall lose his life (or soul) for my sake
shall find it. For what shall a man be
profited, if he shall gain the whole world,
and forfeit his life (or soul) ? or what shall a
man give in exchange for his life (or soul) ? " *

The Master uses what amounts to a play
upon the word *psyche*, which stands for both
the life of the body and the life of the higher

* Matt. xvi. 25, 26 ; Mark viii. 35-37 ; Luke ix. 24, 25.

spiritual self. This double meaning is brought out by the **A.V.**, where it is translated first as " life " and then as " soul." According to this rendering it reads, " Whosoever will save his *life* shall lose it : but whosoever will lose his *life* for my sake shall find it. For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own *soul*? or what shall a man give in exchange for his *soul*?"

It was the higher meaning of " soul," as the spiritual part of man's being, that Christ had in view when he said, " Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me ; for I am meek and lowly in heart : and ye shall find rest unto your *souls*." * It was not physical rest which he promised to his followers, but the spiritual rest which comes to those who learn the lesson of meekness from such a teacher, and who find their burdens shared by such a Divine yokefellow. Again, the soul as the spiritual part of man is immortal and set by Christ in sharp contrast with the life of the body. " Be not afraid," he says to the apostles, as they go forth at his bidding to preach·

* Matt. xi. 29.

the gospel of the Kingdom—" Be not afraid of them which kill the body, but are *not able to kill the soul.*" *

On the other hand, a man is a " fool " who thinks that his soul, as the higher self with its spiritual possibilities and desires, can be satisfied by eating, drinking, and merrymaking, which after all only appeal to the lower self. Such a man is morally responsible for the welfare of his higher life, and his soul is " required " of him if he neglect to make provision for its needs.†

This way of regarding the soul is not confined to the Gospels. In Acts we read of Paul and Barnabas returning to cities and " confirming the *souls* of the disciples." ‡ On the other hand, the leaders of the Church in Jerusalem wrote to Gentile converts of " certain . . . which troubled you with words subverting your *souls* " (Acts xv. 24). This is clearly the religious use of the word " soul." Similarly in Hebrews we read of hope as " an anchor of the *soul* " (vi. 19) and of faith " unto the saving of your *soul* " (x. 39). Persecuted Christians are exhorted

---

* Matt. x. 28.   † Luke xii. 19.
‡ Acts xiv. 22.

to consider Jesus (the author and perfecter
of faith), that " ye wax not weary fainting
in your *souls* " (xii. 3).   In the Epistle
of James the implanted word of God " is
able to save your *souls* from death " (v. 20).
In 1 Peter we meet with the same religious
use of the term.   The end of faith is " the
salvation of (your) *souls* " (i. 9).   In i. 22
we read, " Ye have purified your *souls* in
your obedience to the truth."   And again
in ii. 11, the beloved are besought " to abstain
from fleshly lusts which war against the
soul."   In the same chapter the readers
are spoken of as returning " unto the Shep-
herd and Bishop of your *souls* " (ii. 25).
And those that suffer persecution are ex-
horted to " commit their *souls* in well doing
unto a faithful Creator " (iv. 19).   In 2 Peter
the " righteous *soul* " of Lot is spoken of as
vexed by the sight of wickedness (ii. 8),
while " unsteadfast *souls* " are enticed by
sinners (ii. 14).   In 3 John ver. 2 prayer is
offered that Gaius may prosper and be in
health " even as thy *soul* prospereth,"
where the welfare of the outer bodily life
is compared with the welfare of the inner
life of the soul.

According to the testimony of these various N.T. writers the soul is that in man which is " saved " by the implanted word of God and by the exercise of faith. It can prosper in spiritual health and become confirmed by continuing in the faith ; it is purified by obedience to the truth and vexed at the sight of wickedness. On the other hand, the soul, even of the Christian, has its spiritual perils, for it may be subverted by error, warred against by fleshly lusts ; it may become faint under persecution or unsteadfast through the enticement of sinners. Christ is its Shepherd and Bishop, while the hope of heaven is its anchor. The soul as the " self " survives death—passes first to the abode of the departed in Hades, and may share in the life of the millennium.*

The statement of Dr. R. H. Charles,† that with Paul " the soul is the vital principle of the flesh and is never conceived of, as it is in all the other N.T. writers, as the bearer of the higher spiritual life," is hardly fair to the Pauline usage. We have

* Acts ii. 27 ; Luke xvi. 23 ; Rev. xx. 4.
† *Enc. Bib.* vol. ii. *c.* 1388.

seen how in several instances in the Epistles
the word " soul " stands for the self, the
subject of the personal life. The higher
or spiritual side of the self is certainly
implied in such a passage as, " I will most
gladly spend and be spent for your *souls* "
(2 Cor. xii. 15). It was for the faith of
the Gospel that the Philippians were to
strive " with one *soul* " (Phil. i. 27). Even
slaves were to do their work " from the
soul, ἐκ ψυχῆς " (Eph. vi. 6 ; Col. iii. 23)—
that is, not only " heartily," but, as the
context shows, from a sense of spiritual
obligation to a higher Master as servants of
Christ. The use of this higher meaning
of " soul " is certainly infrequent in the
Pauline literature, but so also is the use
of the term in its other shades of meaning.

That it is almost squeezed out of Paul's
writings by his emphasis on the " spirit "
as the chief element in the Christian life,
and by his consciousness of the contrast
between the natural and the spiritual man,
does not force us to regard it as always
associated with the " flesh," which is so
often used by Paul in an evil sense. A low
valuation is certainly given to the adjective

" soulish," which appears also in the Epistles of James and Jude. In contrast with the " spiritual " (πνευματικός) man, " the natural (soulish, ψυχικός) man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God " ; * and in contrast with the " spiritual " body, " the natural (soulish, ψυχικόν) body " is subject to weakness, dishonour, and corruption.†
Although Paul makes no mention of the existence of the soul after death, still he prays that the *soul*, as well as the spirit and body, " may be preserved without blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." ‡ The soul, in the Pauline psychology, is rather the bearer of the personality of the natural man. In Paul's view, as we shall see later, there is a higher development of personality to which man may attain through the spirit.

Such is the fourfold meaning of " soul " in the pages of the N.T. An inductive study of the occurrences of the word shows it to be the term chosen to express the variety and yet the unity of man's life. It is his life physical, sentient, and spiritual, and yet it is the bearer of that manifold life, its

* 1 Cor. ii. 14. † 1 Cor. xv. 42-44.
‡ 1 Thess. v. 23.

mysterious underlying unity. It is at once both object and subject. The early Hebrew by poetic paraphrase could say " my soul " when he simply meant " I " or " me," but his poetry had the insight of a true philosophy. As through the long centuries of Jewish history the importance of the individual emerged from amid the wreckage of the nation the old way of speaking gained a new depth of meaning, for he found out that life had a worth, his feelings had a significance, his spiritual powers had an importance, because they were all *his* and his alone. His *soul* was the stronghold of his individuality and that within him which witnessed to the inbreathing and presence of the creative Spirit of his God, who had said " Let us make in our image, after our likeness." The coming of Christ, with his teaching of the Fatherhood of God, with his care for the weakest and poorest, and with his message of pardon to the sinful, still further enriched the idea of the soul. He made men feel both its importance and its latent possibilities. The life of a man was of more value than that of the flower or the bird. How much better was a man than a

sheep ! The very world itself was not to be compared with this life, this " soul " within each man. Better to lose the world than to lose the true life within the soul which the death of the body could not extinguish. And yet the *soul* was not all that was in man. Christ made men feel and know its value, he made men conscious of its powers, but his teaching was largely a summons to a yet deeper and divine faculty within his hearers. His was the clear call for men to emerge out of narrow selfhood into the Kingdom of God. In him the Spirit of God spoke and found an echo in the spirit of man. And the way for men to enter into the Kingdom was to be born of the Spirit. The soul is but embryonic life—the life indeed is the life of the spirit. And within each man is a spirit which came from God and through which man may enter into communion with God.

CHAPTER III

THE SPIRIT

BIBLICAL psychology throughout speaks of man as having not only a soul but also a spirit. In the N.T. special emphasis is laid upon this truth, and a development of thought is noticeable in its teaching concerning the spirit (especially in the Pauline Epistles) when compared with that of the O.T. A clear understanding of the exact nature and functions of the human spirit, however, is complicated by two facts. Firstly, the Bible reveals God as Spirit, and so contains frequent reference to the Spirit of God, or the Holy Spirit, or the Spirit of Christ. Many times, however, " spirit " is used without qualification, and then it becomes difficult and sometimes impossible to determine whether it is the human or the divine Spirit which is meant. Paul's writings present a special difficulty in this respect.

Still, the undoubted references to the spirit as a distinctly human faculty or power are numerous enough to form a sound basis for an exposition of the Scriptural teaching on the subject.

Secondly, the term " spirit " is so intimately connected with the term " soul " in etymological derivation and in psychological meaning that it is often a delicate task to distinguish between them. Many writers on Biblical psychology have " darkened counsel " by regarding the two words as synonyms only, useful enough in the poetic parallelism of Hebrew diction, but without significance for an understanding of Hebrew psychology. Others, again, in support of some theological system have raised a dust of doctrinal controversy by exaggerating the differences in their meanings. So that it is hard to examine the nature of the human spirit without becoming involved in discussions as to whether the Bible contains a Dichotomy or a Trichotomy, and whether human nature is bipartite or tripartite, and so losing the true Scriptural standpoint. An examination of the human spirit cannot be carried

4

on without constantly comparing and contrasting it with the soul, but we must be content to let Scripture speak for itself. Sometimes any difference of meaning may be indistinguishable, and at other times there may appear to be a clear distinction. But in the latter case Biblical usage and not any preconceived philosophical conceptions or theological prejudice must determine for us whether they be separate natures, or distinct elements, or different aspects of the inner life of man. Whether the N.T. psychology is dichotomous or trichotomous may well be considered after an impartial survey of its teaching in all its bearings.

1. Spirit and Life

The fundamental question to be faced is the relation in which the spirit of man stands to his life. The soul, as we have seen, is primarily the individual life. What, then, is the spirit in living man ? It is, as Cremer points out, *the principle of life.* The soul is that in each man which lives, the spirit is the power or principle by which he lives. This vital principle in man is due to the presence and power of the Spirit of God.

The soul is life embodied, the spirit is life as coming from God. They are not different in essence. The one is life-human, the other is life God-given. That such is the primary meaning is evident when we turn to the account of man's creation. " And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life ; and man became a living soul " (Gen. ii. 7). In this description the Creator is described as moulding the human body (which is called " dust of the ground ") as a potter fashions a vessel of clay. Then God by the inbreathing of the spirit of life constituted man a " living soul." Two things are made clear in this narrative. The animating principle in created man is the spirit from God. The animated result—a living soul.* Dr. A. B. Davidson (*The Theology of the O.T.* p. 194) says of this passage, " All that seems in question here is just the giving of vitality to man. [The author] represents God Himself as having breath which is the sign or principle of life in Himself ; and this He breathed into man, and it became the same in him." That

* Laidlaw, *Bible Doctrine of Man*, p. 88.

this is so appears from several passages in which the " breath or spirit of life " is spoken of as the animating principle in both animals and man.*   Many passages might be quoted from the O.T. to prove that the life-principle of man is regarded as due to the presence of Spirit from God, but the striking words of Elihu must suffice.   " The Spirit of God that hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty giveth me life." †   In turning to the N.T. we meet the word " spirit " again as the *principle* of life. Jesus declares, " It is the *spirit* that quicken- eth or giveth life " (John vi. 63) ; and James says, " The body apart from the *spirit* is dead " (Jas. ii. 26).   As the principle of life it is contrasted with the soul as the bearer of the life in two passages which occur in the Fourth Gospel, " I lay down my life (τὴν ψυχήν μου) for the sheep," ‡ that is, the individual life.   In the death of Jesus " He bowed his head and gave up the ghost or the *spirit*, τὸ πνεῦμα," § that is, the life-principle.

* Gen. vi. 17, vii. 15, 22.
† Job xxxiii. 4.
‡ John x. 11, 15.
§ John xix. 30; cf. Matt. xxvii. 50 ; Mark xv. 37 ; Luke xxiii. 46.

2. Spirit and Mind

Man's " spirit " in the N.T. comes to mean the principle of life within the mind. This idea finds expression also in the O.T.— " There is a spirit in man : and the breath of the Almighty giveth them understanding " (Job xxxii. 8). Sometimes it is used in the vague sense of the disposition or character. Not more than this seems to be implied in the prophecy that John shall come " in the *spirit* and power of Elijah " (Luke i. 17), or in the beatitude of Jesus, " Blessed are the poor *in spirit*" (Matt. v. 3). The third evangelist reports these words as " Blessed are ye poor " (Luke vi. 20). Very probably the original form of the saying was simply, " Blessed are the poor " (see Harnack's *Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 49, 255). The words " in spirit " are added " to spiritualise the sense and to lay the emphasis rather on the religious and moral than on the social condition of those referred to. Their spirit is poor, because they feel their need of God's help, and are aware that it can come from Him alone." *

The " poor " whom Christ pronounces

* W. C. Allen, *Matthew* (*Inter. Crit. Com.*), p. 39.

" blessed " are those who have a disposition
or character elsewhere described as a " meek
and quiet *spirit*." * Spirit then comes to
mean the inner as contrasted with the outer
life of man. When we to-day speak gener-
ally of man as being made up of body and
mind, we mean thereby that man has an
outer, physical, and visible nature and also
one that is inner, immaterial, and invisible.
The Biblical way of saying this is to speak
of man as consisting of body and soul,
or of flesh and spirit. Here " soul," and
" spirit " are used interchangeably to ex-
press what we mean in general terms by
mind. In this there seems little difference
of meaning between them. They are prac-
tically synonymous terms for the inner
spiritual side of man's nature in contrast to
the outer corporeal side. Hence in the N.T.
man is spoken of by Jesus as consisting of
body and soul (Matt. x. 28) or of flesh
and spirit (Matt. xxvi. 41). † Or again,
without any implied contrast to the bodily

---

* 1 Pet. iii. 4.

† Paul never follows the Biblical usage of speaking of
body and soul, but uses " spirit " to denote a man's inner
life when in contrast to the outer life, *e.g.* " present in
spirit " is the antithesis of " absent in body " (1 Cor. v. 3)

part of man's nature, soul and spirit can be employed together to denote the one inner life. There is an evident parallelism in the Magnificat, "My *soul* (*psyche*) doth magnify the Lord, and my *spirit* (*pneuma*) hath rejoiced in God my Saviour" *; and no difference of meaning is implied in Paul's message to the Philippians, "Stand fast in one *spirit* (*pneuma*), with one *soul* (*psyche*) striving for the faith of the gospel." † When Jesus said, "Now is my *soul* troubled," ‡ he means exactly what the evangelist says of him in the following chapter, "He was troubled in *spirit*." § Many passages might be quoted from the O.T. to show how commonly the Hebrew writers similarly used the two words as practically parallel terms for man's inner nature.

The writers of the N.T., however, regard the spirit as a term of higher import than soul when employed to express the various activities or powers of the mind of man.

or of "absent in the flesh" (Col. ii. 5). Flesh and spirit make up the whole man in 1 Cor. v. 5 and 2 Cor. vii. 1, body and spirit in Rom. viii. 10 and 1 Cor. vii. 34. Only once does he speak of man as having body, soul, and spirit (1 Thess. v. 23).   * Luke i. 46, 47.
  † Phil. i. 27.   ‡ John xii. 27.   § John xiii. 21.

When discussing the significance of " soul,"
we saw that it means in the N.T., apart
from the mere physical life, the seat of
feeling and desire.   This is but one element
in the conscious life of man and closely
related to the physical side of his being.
But " spirit " is in the N.T. a much more
comprehensive term and embraces all states
of   consciousness.   Modern   psychological
analysis reduces all states of mind to those
of feeling, of thinking, and of willing.
" Soul," according to N.T. usage, only
covers the first of these, whereas " spirit "
each and all of them.   When it refers to
the " feeling " side of man's mind, moreover,
it does not refer to the lower side of sensation
or desire, but invariably to the emotional.
Jesus at the request for a sign " sighed
deeply in his *spirit*," * and at the grave
of Lazarus " He groaned in *spirit* and was
troubled." †   When Paul saw Athens full
of idols " his *spirit* was provoked within
him." ‡ The human spirit is also the subject
of joy (Luke i. 46), zeal (Acts xviii. 25 and
Rom. xii. 11), meekness (1 Pet. iii. 4).

* Mark viii. 12.   † John xi. 33.
‡ Acts xvii. 16.

In addition to these emotional states it is also capable of perception (Mark ii. 8), and is the seat of volition, "the *spirit* indeed is willing" (Matt. xxvi. 41; Mark xiv. 38), and purpose, "Paul purposed in the *spirit* to go to Jerusalem" (Acts xix. 21, xx. 22). Finally, it is that through which man attains self-consciousness according to Paul in the memorable words, "Who among men knoweth the things of a man save the *spirit* of the man, which is in him" (1 Cor. ii. 11). So that the spirit of man is what we usually call the human mind in its emotional, intellectual, and volitional states of consciousness. Nay, it is the very power by which man is both aware of his various states of consciousness and of himself as experiencing them. By the soul man dimly feels his selfhood, but through his spirit he attains to complete self-consciousness, which is the fundamental and crowning function of personality.

3. Spirit and God

The highest function attributed to the human spirit by the writers of the N.T. is that of communion with God in the

experiences of the religious life. In this
respect its meaning is similar to the highest
function of the soul, but here again the
distinction which Cremer makes between
the " soul " as the *subject* of life and the
" spirit " as the *principle* of life holds good.
That man has a spirit is due to the inbreath-
ing of the Divine Spirit, " That which is
born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is
born of the Spirit is *spirit*." *   It is because
of this affinity of the human spirit with the
Divine Spirit that man may become " a
true worshipper," for, Christ says, " God is
Spirit ; and they that worship Him must
worship in *spirit* " (John iv. 24). It is the
organ of religious joy (Luke i. 47), and may
be penetrated by the living, active word of
God (Heb. iv. 12). Because it is so mani-
festly a divinely imparted principle, James
speaks of it as " the *spirit* which God made
to dwell in us." †   Thus we see that the
spirit, as Dr. Laidlaw expresses it, is " the
God-given principle of man's life, physical,
mental, and spiritual." ‡

But this divine life-principle, conceived

* John iii. 6.   † Jas. iv. 5.
‡ *The Bible Doctrine of Man*, p. 129.

of as dwelling in a man and bringing him into communion with the Spirit of God, is spoken of as that man's spirit. As such, it is immaterial and capable of a separate existence from the body, " a *spirit* hath not flesh and bones " (Luke xxiv. 39). At death the spirit departs. The dying Stephen said, " Lord Jesus, receive *my spirit* " (Acts vii. 59). In the next world the departed are called " spirits." Christ at his death went " *in the spirit* " and preached " unto the *spirits* in prison " (1 Pet. iii. 19, iv. 6); and in heaven dwell " the *spirits* of just men made perfect " (Heb. xii. 23).

In connection with this higher meaning of spirit, as that through which man has communion with God unbroken even in death, a distinct advance is made by Paul beyond the rest of the teaching contained in the N.T. The term " spirit," according to the Pauline usage, is restricted almost exclusively as a principle of the new regenerate life in Christ. So impressive and central is this truth in the Epistles, that some writers have been led to deny that Paul held that man has a human-creaturely spirit at all. Dr. B. Weiss, in his *Biblical Theology*

of the New Testament (vol. i. pp. 346, 347), asserts that, according to Paul, the natural man has not a spirit as the bearer of the higher life, and that the term " spirit " is used by Paul " in the specific sense of the moral life in the regenerate man." This principle of the new and holy life in the Christian, moreover, is none other than the Holy Spirit. Weiss here largely occupies the position taken up earlier by Holsten and others of his school. The arguments of these writers have been well met by Prof. W. P. Dickson (*St. Paul's Use of the Terms Flesh and Spirit*, pp. 168-78), who follows up and completes the attack led by Wendt.

It is not necessary to enter into the details of a controversy which is now generally regarded as closed. It certainly has tended to establish the fact that Paul did recognise the existence of a human spirit in the natural man, but the great value of the discussion has been to emphasise (what is of far greater importance) the fact that in the regenerate man the interaction of the human and the divine spirit is so intimate as to constitute the Holy Spirit the main factor in the life

of the " new man in Christ Jesus." This development of the doctrine of the human spirit, which we owe to the teaching of Paul, is well expressed by Dr. E. P. Gould, " We must not think of the human spirit as the essential factor in the new man according to Paul. The essential factor is the Divine Spirit, who effects deliverance for the man not by creating or awakening a new faculty in him, but by coming Himself to dwell in him. This is the reason why it is the Holy Spirit, not the human spirit, that is constantly brought into contrast with the ' flesh ' in Paul. . . . The human spirit is evidently the part in which, and upon which, the Holy Spirit works, and through which it controls the man, but which has no office except in connection with the Divine Spirit. Without the Divine Spirit it is like ears in a soundless world. The real agent in substituting holiness instead of sin in man is God, not man." *

Turning now to the Pauline Epistles for evidence of this, we see how he regards the whole man as transformed through the entrance which God's Spirit effects into the human

* Art. " Spirit," *Enc. Bib.*

spirit. When the human mind, which recognises the law of God, but is impotent to keep it,* has been reinforced by the indwelling Spirit of God, a man discovers that " the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus " has made him " free from the law of sin and of death." † A man is thus lifted out of " the flesh," or the sin-dominated bodily nature, and lives " in the spirit," the sphere of the indwelling Spirit of God.‡ Then and only then can the human spirit be said to truly live and become the effective principle of moral conduct in man.§ The spirit of man, when it responds to the guidance of God's Spirit, enables man to realise, as never before, his kinship with God (Rom. viii. 14), and becomes in him the organ of a new self-consciousness. " The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God " (Rom. viii. 16; Gal. iv. 6). While the human spirit in the natural man is, as we have seen, the faculty of rational self-consciousness, under the direct influence of the Holy Spirit it becomes the means whereby regenerate man attains unto

---

* Rom. vii. 14, 25. † Rom. viii. 2.
‡ Rom. viii. 9. § Rom. viii. 10.

full spiritual self-consciousness. Henceforth it is the organ of service rendered unto God (Rom. i. 9, vii. 6). In the worship of God it may transcend the powers of the understanding in the exercise of prayer and praise (1 Cor. xiv. 14, 15). Within the community of the Church it is refreshed by brotherly love (1 Cor. xvi. 18; 2 Cor. vii. 13), and it is that through which the Divine grace is received by every Christian (Gal. vi. 18; Phil. iv. 23; Philem. 25; 2 Tim. iv. 22).

In all these powers and experiences of the human spirit under the direct operation of the Holy Spirit, we see how it comes to be regarded in the N.T. as going far beyond anything of which the soul is capable.

Thus the progress of Christian revelation at last makes explicit an antithesis between soul and spirit which was all along implicit in the rest of the Biblical psychology. This inherent contrast may perhaps be more clearly discerned, under various aspects, in the light of the antithesis between soul and spirit which emerges chiefly in the Pauline anthropology.

4. Soul and Spirit

The human spirit, when yielded up to God completely, becomes, as we have seen, the organ of a God-related life in which the Holy Spirit operates as a new life-principle of righteousness and service in regenerate man. One who thus lives " in the spirit " is called by Paul a " spiritual " (πνευματικός) man, and is set in marked contrast to the " soulish " or " natural " (ψυχικός) man to the disparagement of the latter. The natural or " soulish " man, Paul says, " receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God : for they are foolishness unto him : and he cannot know them, for they are spiritually judged." *   On the other hand, the Apostle says, " He that is *spiritual* (πνευματικός) judgeth all things, and he himself is judged of no man." †   Again, when speaking of death and the resurrection, Paul says, " It is sown a natural (soulish, ψυχικόν) body ; it is raised a *spiritual* (πνευματικόν) body. . . . The first man Adam became a living *soul.* The last Adam became a life-giving *spirit* " (1 Cor. xv. 44, 45).

* 1 Cor. ii. 14.   † 1 Cor. ii. 15.

In these two great passages " soul " and " spirit " are not set in contrast by Paul as two *elements* or constituent parts of human nature, much less are they two separate *natures* in man, but they represent man's inner nature set in different relations. As Dr. Laidlaw says, "The contrast or antithesis with which we are dealing is plainly one between human nature in its own native elements and human nature under the higher power which has entered it in the New Birth. The former is *psychic,* the latter is *pneumatic.* The psychical or soulish man is man as nature now constitutes him and as sin has infected him. . . . The pneumatic or spiritual man is man as grace has reconstructed him and as God's Spirit dwells in him and bestows gifts upon him " (*The Bible Doctrine of Man,* p. 94). Man as such *is* a soul, but he may *have* the fuller, richer life of the Spirit. The soul is life in man's physical body, but man may have through Christ life of such a divine quality that it will require a " spiritual " body at last to be the organ of its perfect expression. If man would regard his soul as derived life only, he could have in his

5

" spirit " the life indeed which flows directly into it from the life-giving Spirit of Christ. Herbert Spencer says that life consists in adjustment to environment. Using the truth contained in this statement, we may say that the N.T. regards the " soul " as life adjusted to a bodily and earthly environment, while " spirit" is life adjusted to a divine and heavenly existence or, what in the Fourth Gospel is called, Eternal Life.

In view of this distinction of the soul, as life humanly conditioned, and spirit, as life divinely imparted, we can better understand the strong words in the Epistle of James which speak of a " soulish " (sensual, R.V. ψυχική) wisdom as being " earthly and devilish " in contrast with " the wisdom which is from above," * or Jude's bitter denunciation of the opponents of the Gospel as being " soulish (sensual, R.V. ψυχικοί) and not having the Spirit." † The question as to whether Scripture teaches that man has three natures or two, or whether the Biblical psychology is trichotomic or dichotomic, appears in the light of the foregoing ex-

* Jas. iii. 15.   † Jude 19.

amination to be irrelevant. Some of the Fathers—especially the Greek Apologists—under the influence of Platonic or Stoic modes of thought, sought to find in the Bible a trichotomy corresponding to that current in philosophical schools, but it led to confusion of thought and was at last abandoned by Christian theologians. But in recent times attempts have again been made to maintain the theory of a Biblical trichotomy of body, soul, and spirit, and this has led to much discussion. In fact the whole modern treatment of Biblical psychology may be said to have grown up as the result of the interest which these controversies have aroused. Dr. J. T. Beck, who was brought into the field by the opinion of two earlier investigators—Roos and Olshausen—holds (*Outlines of Biblical Psychology*) that in Scripture there is a distinct threefold usage of the terms body, soul, and spirit. He says, " The three are specifically different " (p. 38) ; " Soul is the means of bringing body and soul together " (p. 9) ; " The soul has the spirit in and above it " (p. 78) ; " Tied to the soul, spirit no longer has an independent life of its own " (p. 42). Fur-

ther, Dr. F. Delitzsch (*A System of Biblical Psychology*) holds that it cannot be said that either dichotomy or trichotomy exclusively is the Scriptural representation of the constitution of human nature. He says, " Scripture speaks at one time in a definitely dichotomic strain ; at another in a strain as absolutely and undeniably trichotomic " (p. 103). Delitzsch finds in Paul this trichotomic strain. " Paul distinguishes three essential elements in man " (p. 110). A more uncompromising advocate of a Biblical trichotomy is J. B. Heard (*The Tripartite Nature of Man*), who goes beyond Delitzsch's view that there are three " elements " in man's nature, and says that man has three distinct " natures." " Man is a tripartite hypostasis—a union of three, not of two natures only " (p. 10). Bishop Ellicott (*Destiny of the Creature*), commenting on 1 Thess. v. 23, speaks of spirit, soul, and body as three " powers " or " constituents." He says that Paul's prayer is " that each constituent may be preserved to our Lord's coming ; and that each so preserved may be entire and complete in itself " (p. 107). Our examination of the Pauline uses

of the terms " soul " and " spirit " has not
afforded ground for believing that they, with
the body, form three " natures " in man,
nor three distinct " elements." Paul's view
is that man is a duality. " Soul " and
" spirit " are two aspects of his one inner
and spiritual nature. While the " soul "
is viewed more as the subject or animating
principle of his sentient life, yet it has a
higher meaning at times which is synony-
mous with " spirit." The " soul " is
" spirit " bodily conditioned ; the " spirit "
is life directly imparted by God, and there-
fore akin to God, and accessible to divine
and regenerating influences. The only other
N.T. passage which seems to support a
trichotomic view of human nature is Heb. iv.
12, " The word of God is living and active,
and sharper than any two-edged sword, and
piercing even to the dividing of *soul* and
spirit, of both joints and marrow, and quick
to discern the thoughts and intents of the
heart." But here the word of God is not
said to make a division *between* the " soul "
and the " spirit," but *within* them. It is
not the separating function of the two-
edged sword but its dissecting power that

is spoken of.* Just as the thoughts and intents of the heart are revealed by its penetrating analysis, so are also the various powers of both " soul " and " spirit." We may conclude that the N.T., while setting man in three aspects, in the terms " body," " soul," and " spirit," regards him as really twofold in nature. There is a lower, outer, bodily side to his nature, and there is an inner, higher, and spiritual side. The latter, when spoken of as conditioned by the former, is called the " soul," but when spoken of as it is in itself, or as coming from God, is called " spirit."

Men have souls, but not angels nor God. God is a Spirit, and angels are spirits. Man has a spirit. By his body man is linked to the earth beneath him—he is dust of the ground. By his soul he is related to the animals at whose head he stands and to other selves— his fellows around him. By his spirit he becomes conscious of his true selfhood, and of his kinship with the angels above him

* Dr. A. B. Davidson says, " The word of God is so sharp that it pierces and dissects both the soul and spirit, separates each into its parts, subtle though they be, analyses and discerns their thoughts and intents " (*Theology of O.T.* p. 187).

and with God who is over all. In his soul he hears the call of the earthly, the animal, and the human—yes, and at times even of the divine. But it is by his spirit that he directly hears and responds to the call of the Spirit of God that summons him to sonship, to communion with God, and to the life eternal. When man truly hears that Divine imperative he cannot but respond in spirit. When Christ pauses at man's side and says, " Follow Me," it is the voice of the Spirit challenging the soul within to know itself as spirit and to seek the source of life and love, of truth and power in God from whence he came and to whom he needs must go.

CHAPTER IV

THE HEART

THE Hebrew Scriptures are singularly deficient in terms for the intellectual and rational powers of man. One word, "heart," has to do duty for the faculty of thinking, reflection, reasoning, imagining, and the like. Some writers of the N.T. closely follow this old Hebrew usage. But Paul, who was an innovator in the matter of psychological terminology, boldly introduced new terms into Scriptural usage. These he obtained from the Greek of the Septuagint version of the O.T. and from the Greek philosophical schools, where psychological analysis had gone much further than among Jewish writers. In this he was followed by other N.T. writers to some small extent. So that we find a variety of words, such as mind, reason, understanding, and conscience,* used in the N.T. to express

* νοῦς, διάνοια, σύνεσις, συνείδησις, etc.

the various powers of the mind of man in its more distinctively religious and moral aspects. These imported terms, except "conscience," are not used with any great precision, but they are interesting evidence that spiritual experience and reflection within the Christian religion were making a modification and extension of terminology necessary for their expression.

The comparative paucity of Scriptural terms for the intellectual side of man's nature is due to the fact that neither Jewish nor Christian writers were concerned with the mind of man, as mind. Their interest was not philosophical but religious and moral. Truth in matters of religion and ethics was to Biblical writers a matter of revelation, and not the result of the exercise of reason. Hence the processes of the intellectual and moral consciousness were not critically examined or sharply distinguished from one another, and few terms were used to express the practical conception of man's mental life contained in the Bible. In common with other ancient nations the Hebrews attributed a separate psychical activity to the

different organs of the body—such as the bowels, kidneys, heart, etc.—and in speaking of these parts they personified them in a way that became metaphorical only in the later stages of thought. A modern reader, therefore, needs to approach Scriptural terminology used for mental processes with the determination to look at things from the Hebrew standpoint, and to discover the meaning which the Biblical writers wished to convey in each instance.

1. Heart and Mind

The one term used throughout the whole of the N.T. for the mind of man is "heart." Or rather, the heart was regarded as the one organ of the mental life and all its manifold activities. The practice was carried on by all the N.T. writers, even though other words were employed by some of them for special aspects of the mental life. Concerning the psychological use of heart, Dr. Laidlaw says, "This term is the one least disputed in its meaning and which undergoes the least amount of change within the cycle of its use in Scripture. Indeed, it may be held to be common to all parts of the Bible

in the same sense " (*Bible Doctrine of Man,* p. 121).

In approaching this Biblical meaning we need to rid ourselves of the modern usage of using the word " heart " metaphorically for the seat of the emotions exclusively. If we to-day say that a man is " heartless," we imply that he is lacking in proper feeling ; but with Biblical writers a " heartless man " is one devoid of intelligence. The expression translated " men of understanding " (Job xxxiv. 10, 34) is in the Hebrew " men of heart " (אַנְשֵׁי לֵבָב). There is danger then of reading into the word " heart," wherever it occurs, an emotional meaning and of overlooking the intellectual or moral meaning generally expressed by it. Where the Hebrews would speak of " a man of heart," we should popularly describe him as a " brainy man." For a sound exposition of Scripture this distinction must be observed. The ancients had no idea that the brain was the organ of thought. Even so late and scientific a writer as Aristotle supposed that the heart fulfilled that function. We oppose " heart " and " head " in distinguishing between the emotional and the

intellectual. But not so the ancient writers. The heart was the *one* organ of all thinking and of all willing as well as of all feeling. It was the meeting-place of all man's powers of mind and the starting-point of all his activities. It was regarded as the store-house into which all sensations were received and the workshop from which all acts proceeded.*

This way of regarding the heart as the focus and centre of man's conscious life arose from the very primitive and general belief that the life was in the blood. If the blood was shed, the life was lost with it. The Hebrews shared in this belief. " The life of the flesh is in the blood " (Lev. xvii. 11). Hence arose the prohibitions in the O.T. against eating blood, and the association of sacrificial efficacy with the ritual of blood-shedding. The blood diffused through every part of the body was the vehicle of the life of the organism, whether of animals or of men. Now, although it was only in modern times that Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood, yet the ancients were quite familiar with the fact that the

* *Cf.* Beck's *Outlines of Biblical Psychology*, pp. 82-6.

heart was the receptacle of the blood and even the centre of its distribution. Hence if the life was in the blood, the centre of that vitality was the heart.

Out of this primary and physiological conception arose the secondary and psychological meaning of the heart as the focus of man's intellectual and moral life. The term was never used for the " personality," as was soul; the heart was the organ of the personality. The soul functioned through the heart and came thereby to itself in thought and purpose. So that while moderns speak of the mind as the organ of consciousness, the Biblical writers invariably regarded the heart as fulfilling that function. All states of consciousness, whether of thinking or of willing or of feeling, are ascribed to it. Many passages might be quoted to illustrate its use to represent each of these activities of the mind, but the following will suffice.

(1) *The " heart " is the organ of thought and reflection.* In fact all cognitive powers are ascribed to it. " Mary kept all these sayings, pondering them in her *heart* " (Luke ii. 19), " The thoughts of many

hearts " (Luke ii. 35). Through it comes *understanding*. Men perceive with their eyes and hear with their ears, but they " understand with their *hearts* " (Matt. xiii. 15 ; 1 Cor. ii. 9). It is the seat of *reason*. Mark describes certain Scribes as " reasoning in their *hearts* " (Mark ii. 6). With Paul a " senseless *heart* " is associated with men who are " vain in their reasonings " (Rom. i. 21).* It is capable of *belief*. Jesus speaks of a man of faith " who shall not doubt in his *heart* but shall believe " (Mark xi. 23); and Paul says, " With the *heart* man believeth " (Rom. x. 10). It is the storehouse of *memory* (Luke ii. 51) and the source of *imagination* (Luke i. 51). It may become subject to mental callousness (Mark iii. 5, vi. 52).

(2) *It is the organ of willing or conation.* We read of " purpose of *heart* " (Acts xi. 23 ; 2 Cor. ix. 7) and of " singleness of *heart* " (Acts ii. 46 ; Eph. vi. 5). The Israelites " turned back in their *hearts* unto Egypt " (Acts vii. 39). Their wilfulness is called a

* " All men reasoned in their *heart* concerning John " (Luke iii. 15) ; " Jesus saw the reasoning of their *heart* " (Luke ix. 46) ; " Wherefore do reasonings arise in your *heart* ? " (Luke xxiv. 38).

hardening of the *heart* (Heb. iii. 8, 15).
The close connection between heart and
mind appears in the passage, " God did
put in their *hearts* to do His mind and to
come to one mind " (Rev. xvii. 17).

(3) *It is the seat of various kinds of feelings.*
It is the emotional centre of agitation and
fear—" Let not your *heart* be troubled,
neither let it be fearful " (John xiv. 1, 27)
—and of both joy and sorrow (John xvi.
6, 22). It is the seat of remorse—" They
were pricked in their *heart* " (Acts ii. 37).
It is capable of such diverse emotions as
love (Mark xii. 30 ; 1 Pet. i. 22), jealousy
and faction (Jas. iii. 14), and covetous-
ness (2 Pet. ii. 14). More than any other
Biblical writer Paul regards the " heart "
as the seat of feeling. We shall see later
that the Apostle takes over from the Greek
certain psychological terms to express the
mental and moral aspects of man's inner
life, and so is free to develop, in harmony
with O.T. precedents, the emotional meaning
of " heart." The " heart " is spoken of by
Paul as the seat of lust (Rom. i. 24), of
sorrow (Rom. ix. 2), of penitence (Rom. ii. 5),
of desire (Rom. x. 1), of love (2 Thess. iii. 5),

and of peace (Phil. iv. 7), to quote just a few instances of this use. It is highly important that the rich and varied psychological connotation which Biblical writers give to the term " heart " should be fully recognised in exegesis and preaching. As it was by the " heart " that a person was supposed to do all this thinking and willing, this term plays an important part in the N.T. teaching concerning man's moral nature.

2. THE HEART AND THE MORAL CHARACTER

The " heart," being considered in Biblical psychology the organ of all possible states of consciousness, is pre-eminently the seat of the moral consciousness or conscience. In it lies the fountain-head of the moral life of man. Hence in the N.T. the " heart " is the metaphorical term for the whole inner character and its ethical significance cannot be overrated. " Only what enters the heart forms a possession of moral worth, and only what comes from the heart is a moral possession " (Laidlaw, *Bible Doctrine of Man*, p. 122).

Under the old dispensation morality had

been largely a question of overt action. Conduct had been regulated by codes and, in case of transgression, provision was made for ritual purification by a system of sacrifice and offering. But the prophets foresaw and prepared the way for the time when right conduct would spring from a renewed character. This changed moral nature Ezekiel calls " a new heart," which shall be the organ of a " new spirit," a new life-principle.* The ethical teaching of Jesus was characterised by an insistence upon the necessity of inward goodness. " Blessed are the pure in *heart*; for they shall see God " (Matt. v. 8). It is possible for one, whose outward behaviour may be irre-proachable, by giving way to unholy imagi-nation and desire, to " commit adultery in his *heart*," † *i.e.* in the region of moral choice and purpose. Conduct flows from character and reveals the inner moral nature of a man, what Peter calls " the hidden man of the *heart*." ‡ Hence even speech will be brought into judgment. " The good man out of the good treasure of his *heart* bringeth forth

* Ezek. xi. 19, xviii. 31, xxxvi. 26.
† Matt. v. 28. ‡ 1 Pet. iii. 4.

6

that which is good; and the evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth that which is evil; for out of the abundance of the *heart* his mouth speaketh " (Luke vi. 45). All sinful acts and dispositions are the outcome of an evil character. " From within, out of the *heart* of man, evil thoughts proceed, fornication, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, etc." (Mark vii. 21).

In harmony with the teaching of Jesus is the view of the N.T. writers. Those who constantly rebel against God " do always err in their *heart* " *; and to the individual wrongdoer it is said, " Thy *heart* is not right before God." † The Epistle of James in its practical exhortation says, " Purify your *hearts*, ye doubleminded." ‡ In Paul's letters the " heart " is only another name for what he calls " the inward man," § meaning thereby the true character of the man, whose actions are all self-determined. " He that standeth steadfast in his *heart* hath power as touching his own will." ‖ God is said to prove our *hearts* (1 Thess. ii. 4), and

---

* Heb. iii. 10.   † Acts viii. 21.
‡ Jas. iv. 8.   § Rom. vii. 2 ; Eph. iii. 16.
‖ 1 Cor. vii. 37.

the Lord can "stablish your *hearts* un-
blameable in holiness " (1 Thess. iii. 13).*

The prime necessity in all true reforma-
tion is that it should begin with the charac-
ter. " This Scriptural usage—making the
heart the source of the moral life—lends
firmness and simplicity to its teaching about
sin and grace. That man's moral corruption
is seated in his heart means that not the
substance of human nature or the per-
sonality of man is perverted, but his principle
of action. That the saving process begins
with a new heart means that not another
self or personality is substituted, but that
new principles of action are introduced.
Hence the whole doctrine of sin and grace is
biblically grounded in a way to free it from
mistake and exaggeration." †

3. THE HEART AND SPIRITUAL EXPERIENCE

A further advance of thought is taken
by the N.T. writers when they regard the
" heart "—or the moral character—as the

* In many other passages " heart " is used for moral
character (Rom. viii. 27 ; Eph. iv. 18 ; Col. iii. 22 ; 2 Tim. ii.
22).

† Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, art. " Heart."

sphere of divine and saving influence.   It is not only the organ of the physical, mental, and moral life, but also of the mysterious spiritual life which comes from God's indwelling.

Moral reformation is the condition of spiritual recreation.   The two are reciprocal in action, and the " heart " is the term used in the N.T. to denote the inner sphere in which both operate through Divine grace. The personal act of completely surrendering the inmost citadel of personality to God's saving and renewing power is Faith.   The insistence on this moral self-surrender, this giving of the " heart " to God (as the condition of salvation), universalised the Gospel of Christ.   This was perceived by Paul, who, in defence of his preaching to the Gentiles, says of them, " God who knoweth the *heart*, bear them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, . . . cleansing their *hearts* by faith." * Salvation was no longer something to be obtained by outward conformity of action to legally prescribed ceremonial, but henceforth became available to all those who would yield their moral and spiritual nature

* Acts xv. 9.

to God. The very power to yield to God was due to the "prevenient grace," as theologians call it, at work within the deepest centre of personality, as illustrated in the case of Lydia, "whose *heart* the Lord opened, to give heed unto the things which were spoken by Paul." * The man whose moral nature is thus directly open to divine influence is able to dispense with external observances to secure the God-given spiritual life within, for he proves by actual experience that "it is good that the *heart* be established by grace." † Such spiritual blessings come to the believer through God's grace in Christ, and he is able "in the *heart*" to "sanctify Christ as Lord" (1 Pet. iii. 15).

Professor T. K. Cheyne says,‡ "The Pauline Epistles give the heart a central position in the moral nature of man. It has the power of immediate perception of the spiritual truths revealed by God's Spirit. God, we are told, has shone in the hearts of Christians to give the light of the knowledge of the divine glory (2 Cor. iv. 6). . . . The germ of this representation, however, is to

---

* Acts xvi. 14.   † Heb. xiii. 9.
‡ *Enc. Bib.* vol. ii. c. 1982.

be found in the teaching of Jesus. Indeed, the entire Sermon on the Mount impresses the necessity of keeping the heart pure and in constant contact with God and with heavenly things as the condition of pure morality. This again is but the clearer expression of the O.T. view that it is affinity of character that brings a man near to God ; and that the moral and spiritual life which produces character is seated in the inner-most part of man—*i.e.* in his heart." The belief of Paul concerning the " heart," as the sphere of divine operation in man, finds expression in many passages which reach the high-water mark of N.T. teaching as to the possibilities of human nature when laid open to the Spirit of God. The Gospel message—" the word of faith which we preach "—says the Apostle, " is nigh thee, in thy mouth and in thy *heart*." It not only finds a lodgment *in* the " heart " (as the intellect or reason), it meets also with a response *from* the " heart " (as the organ of the spiritual life), " for with the *heart* man believeth unto righteousness ; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." *

* Rom. x. 8, 10.

The " heart," then, means the inmost and essential part of man whereby the human spirit functions in response to the presence of the Divine Spirit, " The love of God hath been shed abroad in our *hearts* through the Holy Spirit which was given unto us." * The " heart " is the meeting-place of the human spirit and the Holy Spirit. Hence while it is true that " the Spirit himself beareth *witness with our spirit*, that we are the children of God," † it is in *the heart* that the Spirit of adoption bears its witness to the spirit of man, " Because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our *hearts*, crying, Abba, Father." ‡ But the measure of the Holy Spirit given in justification and adoption is only a first instalment of the divine influence yet to be experienced in man. In establishing the believer in fellowship with Christ and anointing him with divine unction, God, says the Apostle, " sealed us," marked us as His, giving us the " earnest (or first fruits) of the Spirit *in our hearts*." §

In the Epistle to the Ephesians, wherein

* Rom. v. 5.   † Rom. viii. 16.
‡ Gal. iv. 6.   § 2 Cor. i. 22.

Paul has a vision of the unity and corporate life of believers of all nations within the Church, the full extent of the work of the Holy Spirit within the " hearts " of Christians comes into view in two remarkable passages. The writer's insight into the manifold spiritual results of the divine indwelling causes him to break into prayers that are almost inarticulate with excess of emotion. His desire, he says, is that " the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him ; having the eyes of your *heart* enlightened, that *ye may know* what is the hope of His calling, what the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints, and what the exceeding greatness of His *power* to us-ward who believe." * The strange expression " the eyes of your *heart* " is used to emphasise the truth that to the renewed and sanctified nature of man is given a spiritual insight and intuition into divine truth. The second passage, again a prayer, insists also on the *knowledge* given to the enlightened " heart " (or mind), but it also

* Eph. i. 17-19.

repeats the truth that spiritual *power* is imparted to the believer. This prayer to God is, " that ye may be strengthened with *power* through His Spirit in the inward man ; that Christ may dwell in your *hearts* through faith ; to the end that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be strong to apprehend with all the saints what is the breadth, and length, and height, and depth ; and to *know* the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge." *

Knowledge of divine truth, argues the Apostle, brings a feeling of certainty to the mind, and the free exercise of God-given power gives a sense of mastery and serenity to the moral life. The result is peace. The intellectual processes of the " heart " find satisfaction in reaching Truth, the moral functions of the " heart " are harmonised in attaining Goodness, and the emotional states of the " heart " are fulfilled in Love. The " peace of God which passeth all understanding," *i.e.* all human ratiocination, " shall guard your *hearts* and your thoughts in Christ Jesus." † Peace shall not only act as sentry at the door of the

* Eph. iii. 16-19, † Phil. iv. 7.

" heart," it shall enter within, putting an end to all inward strife and discord. So, pleads the Apostle, " let the peace of Christ rule (or arbitrate) in your *hearts*, to the which also ye were called in one body." * The divine influence is conceived by Paul in the beginning of his ministry as moral energy intended to " stablish your *hearts* unblameable in holiness before our God " (1 Thess. iii. 13), " to comfort your *hearts*, and stablish them in every good work and word " (2 Thess. ii. 17), or again, to " direct your *hearts* into the love of God and into the patience of Christ " (2 Thess. iii. 5). But a growing experience of the work of God within all the processes of " the heart," as intellect, will, and feeling, shows him that the final result is knowledge, power, and peace.

4. MIND AND UNDERSTANDING

Paul, we have seen, enlarges the psychological meaning of " heart " to include all that we mean by mind, and deepens our conception of it as the threefold organ of thought, of volition, and of emotion, which

* Col. iii. 15.

God's Spirit may fully possess and influence.
But he recognises that in so expanding our
conception of the meaning and processes of
the " heart," understood generally as the
organ of mind, he needs a special term or
terms to describe the speculative, rational
functions of mind. The Greek thinkers had
exalted Reason as the highest power in man
of attaining both truth and virtue. The
organ of all reflection and moral judgment,
in their view, was the mind in the narrower
sense of the word—the *Nous*, or the Under-
standing. The term "nous " was current in
all the Hellenistic schools of thought, and
Paul would be familiar with it also from its
occurrence in the Greek version of the O.T.
which he used. It occurs in the Septuagint
half-a-dozen times as a translation of the
Hebrew word for " heart " (*lebh* or *lebhabh*).
The Apostle knew how highly the Greeks
thought of the *nous*, or the understanding ;
he knew also by experience both its power
and its weakness as a special faculty of the
mind, and so he takes it up into his psycho-
logical vocabulary and uses it, along with
other cognate terms,* which, however, are

* διάνοια, σύνεσις, συνείδησις, etc.

generally indistinguishable in meaning, to express either the faculty of reflective thought and moral judgment, or some special function of mind, such as imagination or discernment.*

Paul's estimate of the " mind " in unregenerate man is seen in Rom. vii., where its functions as the moral consciousness are described. The moral law brings to the mind the consciousness of sin, " I had not known sin, except through the law " (ver. 7). The mind assents to the demand of the law, and even delights in it (ver. 22). But sin entrenched within the " flesh " dominates

---

* Some of the Greek terms mentioned above occur, though very rarely, in the other books of the N.T. Once only do we meet with " nous " in the Synoptic Gospels as the faculty of understanding, " Then opened He their *mind* (νοῦς) that they should understand the Scriptures " (Luke xxiv. 45). The use of it twice in Revelation (xiii. 18, xvii. 9) is probably ironical only. In no other book of the N.T. does it occur outside the Pauline Epistles. Understanding (σύνεσις), as a function of mind, is referred to in Mark vii. 18 and Luke ii. 47, and can be rendered " discernment." The the term διάνοια, for mind or understanding, occurs once in the Synoptics—Matt. xxii. 37 ; Mark xii. 30 ; Luke x. 27— in the quotation from Deut. vi. 5 in expansion of the meaning of " heart." In Heb. viii. 10, x. 16, heart and mind are synonymous. In 1 Pet. i. 13 and 2 Pet. iii. 1 " mind " is used in the ordinary sense. In 1 John v. 20 it seems to be limited to a function of the mind.

the inward man, and the "law in my
members," says Paul, wars against "the
law of my *mind*, bringing me into captivity
under the law of sin " (ver. 23). By the mind
man is conscious of sin and conscious also
of his inability to resist it. The mind en-
lightens but it does not save. It is morally
impotent. "I myself with the *mind* serve
the law of God ; but with the flesh the law
of sin " (ver. 25). In the following chapter
the Apostle shows that the new life-principle
of the Spirit supplies the Christian with the
power lacking in the mind of the natural
man.

As the rational understanding the mind is
contrasted by Paul with the human spirit
when under certain abnormal and super-
natural conditions (1 Cor. xiv. 14-15). In
this passage " spirit " is used in a special
sense, and " represents the inner man under
control of a spiritual or prophetic afflatus." *
For purposes of edification and comfort the
use of the mind or understanding " in
prophesying " is superior to the exercise of
the spiritual gift of " tongues," which no
one understandeth, and so the writer con-

* Laidlaw, *Bible Doctrine of Man*, p. 125.

cludes, " In the church I had rather speak
five words with my understanding, that I
might instruct others also, than ten thou-
sand words in a tongue " (ver. 19).

While the mind thus fulfils the noble
function of the moral judgment and the
rational understanding, it becomes " re-
probate " if it rejects the knowledge of God.*
Reason did not save the Gentiles from
alienation from God, and so they " walk in
the vanity of their mind, being darkened
in their understanding." † The Pastoral
Epistles reflect the Apostle's later distrust
of the mind as liable to be " corrupted " by
contentious self-seeking and obstinate re-
jection of the truth.‡ Wilful unbelief and
corruption of life react upon the mental and
moral consciousness, and pervert it.§ On
the other hand, man may be transformed by
the renewing of the mind, which, under the
Divine influence, gains a new insight into
the " good and acceptable and perfect will
of God." ‖ The spiritual man may be said
to have the " mind of Christ," ¶ and is

---

* Rom. i. 28.   † Eph. iv. 18.
‡ 1 Tim. vi. 5 ; 2 Tim. iii. 8.   § Titus i. 15.
‖ Rom. xii. 2.   ¶ 1 Cor. ii. 16.

renewed by the regenerating influence of the
Holy Spirit which can be personally appro-
priated as " the spirit of your mind." *

5. CONSCIENCE

Many of the psychological terms of the
N.T. have a certain fluidity that makes it
difficult at times to fix the exact meaning
that is to be attached to them. But an
examination of the term " conscience " will
show that it is used with unvarying pre-
cision and consistency. The reason for this
is that " it was introduced into the N.T. as
a full-fledged idea." It only occurs once in
the Septuagint, and then rather means
" consciousness " or " thoughts " (Eccles.
x. 20). The Apocryphal book of Wisdom
has it in xvii. 11, where it corresponds to our
use of the word. It does not appear in the
Gospels, except in John viii. 9, which is
omitted in the R.V. and regarded by most
textual critics as not genuine. The rest of
the N.T. has it thirty-one times in the follow-
ing places : twice in Acts, xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16
(both Paul's speeches), twenty-one times

* Eph. iv. 23.

in the Pauline Epistles, five times in Hebrews, and three times in 1 Peter.

It is distinctly a Pauline word, and, like "nous," adopted as a technical term from Greek sources. "Nous" (mind or reason) represents both the intellectual and moral consciousness, but " conscience " is used for the moral consciousness alone. It already had this significance among the Stoics, and it is doubtless from them that Paul and the other N.T. writers who employ the word derived the term as best fitted to express that faculty in man which passes moral judgment on human conduct.

Lightfoot says, " It is difficult to estimate, and perhaps not very easy to overrate, the extent to which Stoic philosophy had leavened the moral vocabulary of the civilised world at the time of the Christian era. To take a single instance : the most important of moral terms, the crowning triumph of ethical nomenclature, συνείδησις, conscientia, the internal, absolute, supreme judge of individual action, if not struck in the mint of the Stoics, at all events became current coin through their influence. To a great extent, therefore, the general diffusion

of Stoic language would lead to its adoption by the first teachers of Christianity ; while at the same time, in St. Paul's case, personal circumstances might have led to a closer acquaintance with the diction of this school."*

Of course the idea was not absent from the Bible, but it was expressed, as we have seen, by the term " heart " in both Old and New Testaments. It is only the terminology which is Greek. As the term " heart " was so general as to include all mental activities, another word was needed to express the organ of moral judgment. To some extent the need was met by the introduction of the word " nous," but as this already included the rational understanding, the process of psychological specialisation which we see going on in the N.T. writings made it desirable to employ one word, and one word only, for man's power of self-judgment in respect of moral action, and that word already current in Hellenistic circles was " conscience." It was taken up by N.T. writers and employed in much the same sense as the word signifies to-day.

The first instance of the use of this term

* Commentary on Philippians, p. 303.

7

by Paul occurs in two of his speeches recorded in Acts. To the Council in Jerusalem Paul was able to declare, " I have lived before God in all good *conscience* until this day " (Acts xxiii. 1), and later at Cæsarea before Felix he said, " Herein do I exercise myself to have a *conscience* void of offence toward God and men alway " (Acts xxiv. 16). In these passages the Apostle justified his conduct to both Jew and Gentile by affirming it to be in accord with his conscience. His appeal was to an element or faculty in man recognised by each as passing moral judgment on conduct. Speaking to Jewish hearers, the divine element in conscience is emphasised by Paul. His conduct, controlled by it, is living " before God." In addressing his Gentile hearers both the human and the divine aspects are recognised, " a conscience void of offence toward God and men." The Apostle, in his defence, took his stand upon the common and unassailable ground that what he had done was in accordance with " conscience," the demands of which both Jew and Gentile acknowledged.

In harmony with this broad view of con-

science, Paul, early in his Epistle to the
Romans, develops and applies his ethical
doctrine in a passage that is regarded as the
locus classicus of the N.T. teaching on the
subject (Rom. ii. 14, 15). The Apostle had,
in the earlier portion of the Epistle, been
exposing the awful corruption into which
the Gentile world had fallen. His sombre
picture and its relentless analysis of the
immorality of his age accords with the un-
sparing criticism of Juvenal, who satirised
Rome as the " sink of the nations." Paul
then passes on to warn men of the " righteous
judgment of God " that shall be passed
upon both Jew and Greek, " for there is no
respect of persons with God." The Jews,
he argues, have received the revelation of
the moral law from God, and by that law
they shall be judged, " as many as have
sinned under the law, shall be judged by the
law." But what about the Gentiles, who
had no moral law revealed to them, and who
therefore, according to the view of many
Jews, had no law at all ? In answering
this objection, which was very real to many
people in the time of the Apostle, and still
is in modern times, Paul says : The Gentiles

will be judged in accordance with the moral law revealed in their consciences. But, it may be asked, is there such a revelation ? Yes, says the Apostle, for " when the Gentiles, which have no law, do by nature the things of the law, these, having no law, are a law unto themselves : in that they show the work of the law written in their hearts, their *conscience* also bearing witness therewith, and their thoughts (reasonings) one with another accusing or else excusing them " (ver. 14). The way to explain this passage is to put the words " which have no law " and " having no law " within inverted commas as being quotations of the very objection with which Paul had to contend. The Apostle himself would not admit the truth of the objection. His whole argument is against it. Still, he wants to be fair to his objectors' contention. His argument therefore is, that the Gentiles, " having no law " (*i.e.* " who *ex hypothesi* have no law, whom we conceive as having no law," Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 59), must be a " law unto themselves." For while it is true that the Gentiles " have no law," in the sense of a revealed and authoritative

moral code, yet it must be admitted that
as often as they " do by nature the things
of the law " (as Jewish objectors admit),
they give evidence of an authoritative law
deep-seated in their moral nature. The
existence and function of conscience as
universal facts of human experience prove
it, beyond any possibility of doubt.

Conscience, then, witnesses to the fact
that men live under moral law, and con-
science judges human conduct in accordance
therewith. Conscience is not a law-giver—
it is an administrator of law. God is the
Law-giver, conscience is His judge within.
God may cause this law to be written on
tables of stone or may impress it upon
" the heart," upon the mind and moral
nature of man. But in either case con-
science bears witness to the law, and by
means of accusing or excusing thoughts
passes judgment upon the actions of the
recipient of that law. It thus forms a basis
of belief in a final judgment, " in the day
when God will judge the secrets of men."

But the Apostle, while thus amply recog-
nising the reality and authority of conscience
in all men, is fully aware of its limitations

and dangers. A lack of knowledge involves
a corresponding feebleness of conscience.
Belief in one God, the Father, and in our
Lord Jesus Christ, gives immeasurable free-
dom and strength to the moral life. " How-
beit," he says, " in all men there is not that
knowledge ; and their conscience being *weak*
is defiled." * Uncleanness of conduct re-
acts in perverting both mind and conscience.
" To them that are defiled and unbelieving
nothing is pure, but both their mind and
conscience are defiled." † Whereas, when
our conscience regulates our conduct and
enforces obedience to God, it is called
" pure." ‡ Those that fall away are
" branded (seared) in their own conscience
as with a hot iron." § But, on the other
hand, conscience may be educated through
the Divine Revelation in Christ, and en-
lightened by the Holy Spirit. ‖

A new standard of conduct is supplied
and a new motive for obedience is imparted
by Christianity. Hence faith (subjective
and objective) reacts favourably on con-

---

* 1 Cor. viii. 7. † Titus i. 15.
‡ 2 Tim. i. 3 ; *cf.* Heb. xiii. 18.
§ 1 Tim. iv. 2. ‖ Rom. ix. 1.

science. " Faith unfeigned " goes with " a
good conscience " (1 Tim. i. 5). To hold the
faith ensures a " pure conscience " (1 Tim.
iii. 9). The close connection between faith
and conscience is shown by the fact that
those who have thrust from them " a good
conscience," as a result " make shipwreck
concerning the faith " (1 Tim. i. 19). The
range and authority of conscience are greatly
increased by the fuller revelation of the will
of God in Christ. The Christian obeys the
authority of states and rulers not by the
compulsion of fear, but in so far as the ex-
ternal law which they impose is itself an
expression of the good to which conscience
witnesses. So we " must needs be in sub-
jection, not only because of wrath, but for
conscience' sake " (Rom. xiii. 5).

The principle " for conscience' sake," once
enunciated by the Apostle, moralises many
acts which ordinarily fall beneath the range
of ethical judgment—such as eating and
drinking.* For when conscience is regu-
lated by the claims of " love which edifieth "
(1 Cor. viii. 1), the effect of our action upon

* *Cf.* Kilpatrick, article " Conscience " in Hastings'
Dict. of Bible.

others must be considered. "All things may be lawful, but all things edify not." So the subject of eating things offered to idols (which was a critical problem in Corinth) is lifted by the Apostle out of the arena of intellectual argument. It becomes a question to be decided by the Christian conscience, *i.e.* by conscience not merely enlightened by knowledge, but conscience made tender by love. Thus " for conscience' sake " supplies a liberating and restraining principle that regulates the minutest detail of conduct so as to " give no occasion of stumbling, either to Jews, or to Greeks, or to the church of God " (1 Cor. x. 25-32). Christianity produces a behaviour, manifests a truth, and develops a character which appeal to conscience, and finds in the response of conscience its surest justification.*

In Hebrews and 1 Peter also " conscience " is used consistently for the faculty of moral judgment. As the consciousness of evil it is called " *conscience* of sins " † ; as a faculty of the " heart " it may be cleansed, for we may have " our hearts

* 2 Cor. i. 12, iv. 2, v. 11. † Heb. x. 2.

sprinkled from an evil *conscience*." * Ritual observance in the way of gifts and sacrifices "cannot as touching the *conscience* make the worshipper perfect." Whereas the blood of Christ "does cleanse your conscience." † The aspect of conscience as moral judgment according to a divine law is brought out in 1 Peter by the phrase "a conscience toward God," ‡ or a "good conscience toward God!" § A similar idea is brought out by saying that "a good manner of life in Christ" produces "a good conscience" (1 Pet. iii. 16).

In reviewing the N.T. references to "conscience" as a faculty or function of the "heart," it can be seen that though the term is new in Biblical language, yet conscience itself is recognised as a universal psychological fact witnessing to God and to a revelation of the divine will. It is regarded as the consciousness of obligation to God sufficiently clear to make all men morally responsible for their actions. It brings conviction of sin and bears witness to goodness, but its judgments are in accord-

* Heb. x. 22.   † Heb. ix. 9, 14.
‡ 1 Pet. ii. 19.   § 1 Pet. iii. 21.

ance with the moral standards under which
men live.   Christianity makes provision for
cleansing and regulating conscience.   It sup-
plies it with a new standard of character
in Christ and a new guiding principle of love.

Such, in bare outline, is the system of
ideas which, in the N.T., began to crystallise
round the term "conscience."   Subsequent
Christian thought and philosophic reflection
have greatly enriched the conception, and
to-day the subject of " Conscience " seems
likely to provide a common meeting-ground
for Ethics and Religion to settle many of
their historic differences.   " The conscious-
ness of obligation," says Gaston Frommel
in his suggestive and profound monograph
La Foi, étude de psychologie religieuse (1910),
" is more than a feeling, it is *an imposed
experience*.   It is the specific characteristic
of Duty that it progressively engages the
human being in a relation which only be-
comes more and more moral because it
becomes more and more personal, that is to
say, religious." *

* For a full discussion of the Christian doctrine of Con-
science, see Newman Smyth's *Christian Ethics*, Davison's
The Christian Conscience, and Kilpatrick's article on " Con-
science " in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*.

CHAPTER V

THE FLESH

THE term " flesh " is one of the storm-centres of Biblical theology. Upon what interpretation is given to it in some passages depend important theological consequences. The right psychological meaning must be firmly grounded before a sound doctrinal superstructure can be built upon it. In this instance especially it is true that Biblical psychology is a necessary preliminary to Biblical or to dogmatic theology. And to arrive at the psychological significance of the term reflected in the N.T. we must again purge our minds from later ideas that have attached themselves to the word. The mention of the word " flesh " in such an enumeration as " the world, the flesh, and the devil," for instance, calls up the idea of sensuality or at least sensuousness.

Broadly speaking, " flesh " is held to signify
the grosser appetites and animal impulses
in man.   That the Scriptural usage includes
this meaning will appear later, but it in-
cludes many others as well.   These other
meanings can only be arrived at by a
patient analysis of the passages in which
the word occurs and by viewing them in the
light of O.T. usage.

Then again, certain philosophical con-
ceptions prejudice some writers, as we shall
see, in their interpretation of the word.
This leads to confusion of thought when the
wider doctrinal aspects of N.T. teaching
come to be studied.   In looking for traces
of Greek influence in N.T. phraseology, the
profounder influence of O.T. usage is often
neglected.   That in this term, as in others,
there is a development of meaning noticeable
within N.T. writings, due in part to the
pervasive influence of Hellenistic culture,
is not to be denied.   But the path of ap-
proach to Christian truth is not through
the Porch or the Academy, but through the
Temple.

And then due allowance must be made for
the development of the religious experience

of the early believers. The terminology of the N.T. grows not so much by accretions from foreign systems of teaching, as by internal spiritual life within the Christian community. The vocabulary taken over from the Hebrew Scriptures, while modified from without, is yet more profoundly modified from within. Hence in seeking to understand the various shades of meaning expressed by the word " flesh," we must guard against both the popular and the philosophic modes of interpretation. The popular usage would make us see less than the term contains, and the philosophic tends to make us see more. To steer a clear course between these two dangers will be the aim of the following examination. And with the guiding principles of fidelity to O.T. precedents and a due recognition of spiritual development we may hope to arrive at the truth.

1. FLESH AND BODY

In the O.T. " flesh " (*basar*) is frequently used in the literal sense for the material tissue of the body, as distinct from the skin, bones, or blood, both of men and of

beasts.* That no uncleanness or moral taint was associated with it is clear from the fact that it was allowed to be partaken of as food, and was offered to Jahweh in sacrifice. The term " flesh " (*sarx*) in this literal sense occurs but seldom in the N.T., † but it frequently designates the body by synecdoche, or putting the part for the whole. In this the well-known O.T. precedent is followed, for, as Dr. A. B. Davidson points out, " Properly speaking, Hebrew has no term for body. The Hebrew term around which questions relating to the body must gather is *flesh*. . . . The flesh being the most outstanding part of the living creature, covering the bones and containing the blood, it naturally came to be used, the part being taken for the whole, of the living creature in general. In this sense it represents the creature as an organised being, flexible, smooth, and possessing members." ‡ Now, although the N.T. does contain the term " body " (*soma*), a consideration of which does not concern us here, yet the O.T.

---

* Lev. ix. 11, xiii. 11 ; Gen. xli. 2.
† John vi. 52 ; 1 Cor. xv. 39 ; Rev. xvii. 16.
‡ *The Theology of the O.T.* p. 188.

practice of using " flesh " when only " body "
is meant still persists in the N.T. For
instance, it is said of Jesus Christ that he
" is come in the *flesh* " (1 John iv. 2), that
he " suffered in the *flesh* " (1 Pet. iv. 1), was
" put to death in the *flesh* " (1 Pet. iii. 18),
nor did his *flesh* see corruption (Acts ii. 31).
That the two terms " flesh " and " body "
are frequently quite synonymous can be
seen in the cases in which they are used
interchangeably even by the same writer.
For example, Paul says that husbands
ought to love their wives " as their own
bodies," for, he argues, " no man ever
hateth his own *flesh* " (Eph. v. 28, 29).   To
prove that he who " is joined to a harlot is
one *body*," he quotes the words " the twain
shall become one *flesh* " (1 Cor. vi. 16).
Again, Paul speaks of the life of Jesus being
" manifested in our *body* " (2 Cor. iv. 10),
and in the next verse as " manifested in our
mortal *flesh*."   To the Corinthians he writes
of his being " absent in *body* " (1 Cor. v. 3),
while to the Colossians of being " absent in
the *flesh* " (Col. ii. 5).   Sometimes the two
are used as a dual expression for the whole
of the outer man, *e.g.* " reconciled in the

body of his *flesh*" (Col. i. 22), and "the putting off of the *body* of the *flesh*" (Col. ii. 11).

In the light of these examples it can be claimed that "flesh" is often used for the whole body as a visible organism.* As such, "flesh" is one of the constituent parts of human nature, forming the lower side of man. This is quite in accordance with the O.T. usage, where "flesh" is combined with either "soul" or "heart" to express the whole man, outer and inner, as a personal being, *e.g.* "his *flesh* upon him hath pain, and his *soul* within him," † "my *flesh* and my *heart* faileth." ‡ In one passage the three are united to express the entire man— "my *soul* longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of the Lord ; my *heart* and my *flesh* cry out unto the living God." § The Hebrews did not feel the sharp contrast between the outer and inner which prevailed in

---

* Further examples are 1 Cor. vii. 28 ; 2 Cor. x. 2-4 ; Gal. iv. 13, 14 ; Phil. i. 22, 24 ; Col. i. 24. In some of these passages, it is true, "flesh" is correlated or even contrasted with "spirit," though not in the strictly ethical sense to be discussed later. Yet, as pointed out by Cremer, a question of *value* does enter into the use of the term.

† Job xiv. 22.   ‡ Ps. lxxiii. 26.   § Ps. lxxxiv. 2.

more analytic times. Whatever duality
they acknowledged, they did not disparage
the material side of their being, as in the
rigid dualism of the Greeks. In fact the
" flesh " as well as the " soul " and " heart "
shared in the religious relationship of God.
" My *soul* thirsteth for Thee, my *flesh* longeth
for Thee " (Ps. lxiii. 1).

Paul follows along this line also in com-
bining " body " and " spirit " to express
the two sides of human nature. " She that
is unmarried is careful for the things of the
Lord, that she may be holy both in *body* and
in *spirit* " (1 Cor. vii. 34). " Body " and
" spirit " are used together in 1 Cor. v. 3 in
exactly the same sense as " flesh " and
" spirit " in Col. ii. 5. And in view of
Paul's ethical antithesis between " flesh "
and " spirit " it is the more remarkable to
find how often he combines the two to ex-
press the synthesis of man's two parts,
outer and inner (Rom. ii. 28-9 ; 1 Cor. v. 5),
just as other writers of the N.T. use
" soul " and " body." In 2 Cor. vii. 5 we
read " our *flesh* had no relief," while in ii. 13
the Apostle says, " I had no relief for my
spirit "—either term being used by synec-

8

doche for the whole man. The expressions
" my face in the *flesh* " (Col. ii. 1) and
" Christ after the *flesh* " (2 Cor. v. 16)
represent the outer and visible man. Hu-
man existence on the earth is called " to
live or abide " in the *flesh* (Gal. ii. 20 ; Phil.
i. 22, 24). Sin affects both sides of a man's
life, both " flesh " and " mind " (Eph. ii. 3)
and " flesh " and " spirit " (2 Cor. vii. 1).

In the Synoptics and other parts of the N.T.
man is a synthesis of " body " and " soul " ;
in the O.T. of " flesh " and " soul," or
" flesh " and " heart " ; and of " flesh "
and " spirit " in the Pauline writings. These
are Scriptural and interchangeable ways of
saying that man is dual in nature. They
hardly express the radical antithesis of
" matter " and " mind," because in these
modern terms the contrast is between ma-
terial and immaterial, or between what is
dead and what is living. In Scripture, on
the other hand, " flesh " was living matter
and " soul " was embodied life or " spirit."

2.   Flesh and Relationship

Out of the former uses there arises by a
natural transition the idea of the flesh as the

medium of relationship through descent, kinship, marriage, or nationality. In modern popular speech we usually employ the term "blood" to express this relationship of family, clan, or nation. We speak of "blood relations," of the "ties of blood," and we say that "blood is thicker than water." The Biblical writers rather thought of the "flesh" as the bond of union. This conception is founded on the passage, "Therefore shall a man cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one *flesh*" (Gen. ii. 24). Jesus quotes these words in declaring the marriage bond to be indissoluble,* and Paul also quotes them as an argument against moral impurity,† and a reason for the love of husbands and wives.‡ Out of this primary idea, that the "flesh" is the basis of union in marriage, there arose the more comprehensive use of the term to embrace all natural relationship. The Pauline Epistles give frequent expression to the idea, but it is to be met nowhere else in the N.T. except in Hebrews, where we read of "the fathers of our *flesh*" (xii. 9).

* Matt. xix. 5 ; Mark x. 8.
† 1 Cor. vi. 16. ‡ Eph. v, 25-31.

Paul declares that Christ is "born of the seed of David according to the *flesh*" (Rom. i. 3). Abraham is spoken of by him as "our forefather according to the *flesh*" (Rom. iv. 1). Israelites are "my kinsmen according to the *flesh*" (Rom. ix. 3), while all others are called "Gentiles in the *flesh*" (Eph. ii. 11). On the other hand, the bond of union between man and God is an ethical relationship in contrast to natural kinship, "It is not the children of the *flesh* that are children of God, but the children of the promise" (Rom. ix. 8). Any close human association is also designated by this term, although there may be no blood-relationship. Hence we read of "masters according to the *flesh*" (Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii. 22), and even a slave may be regarded as a brother "both in the *flesh* and in the Lord" (Philem. 16).

This use of *flesh*, in so far as it stands for the medium of physical descent, that through which the race is propagated, will help us to find the term which harmonises Paul's historical and psychological accounts of the origin of sin, which have been declared to be irreconcilable. Wernle says (*The Be-*

ginnings of Christianity, vol. i. E.T. pp. 230-3), " What is the origin of sin ? St. Paul gives two answers to this question, the difference between which is not explained in his letters. 1. The whole of mankind is involved in the fall of the first man. Through the first man, Adam, came sin, and as its consequence, death unto all men. 2. Sin clings to man's bodily nature. All men are flesh, and sin dwells in the flesh. Man is sold under sin because he is flesh. In 1 Cor. xv. death is derived from Adam's fall, and afterwards from Adam's earthly nature, without any attempt at reconciling the two statements. And the same applies to sin—the connection between flesh and sin is either antecedent or subsequent to the fall. In the first case it is the cause ; in the latter the effect. . . . St. Paul did not shirk these ultimate questions, but he came to no satisfactory conclusion, and contented himself with answers which are contradictory." This criticism of Wernle becomes pointless if we bear in mind the implied reference in " flesh " to the medium of descent. If we state with Paul that sin had its origin *historically* in the fall of Adam, and yet

psychologically has its origin somehow in the flesh, we do not state two irreconcilable theories if we remember that " flesh " is recognised by Paul as the basis of human propagation.   If sin began in Adam, it naturally reappears in his descendants according to the flesh, when the " flesh " is regarded as the medium of the propagation of sinful human nature.   The modern theory of the law of heredity helps us to understand the Pauline doctrine of hereditary corruption as historically originating in the first man, yet manifesting itself again in each of his descendants " according to the flesh."

3.   FLESH AND HUMAN NATURE

The term " flesh " has a third meaning in the N.T. when it is used for " human nature " generally.   Just as the idea of flesh proper is extended to the body, and then to relationship, especially blood relationship, so by a natural transition it extends to all mankind (as in the frequent phrase " all flesh "), and to the idea of " human nature " suggested thereby.   In the O.T. all living creatures are included— " All flesh died that moved upon the earth,

both fowl, and cattle, and beast, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man " (Gen. vii. 21). Wendt makes a strong point of this meaning of the term. He says,* " Here we perceive that it is no longer used of the flesh on the body, or of the whole body taking its name from the flesh. When it is affirmed of ' all flesh ' as subject, that it has corrupted its way upon earth (Gen. vi. 12), or that on the ground of the divine revelation of judgment it comes to know that Jehovah is the Saviour and Redeemer of Israel (Isa. xlix. 26 ; *cf.* xl. 5 ; Ezek. xxi. 4, 5), or that it comes up to worship Jehovah (Isa. lxvi. 23 ; *cf.* Ps. lxv. 2, cxlv. 21), it is evident that it is meant to designate not merely the outward bodily side, but *living beings generally*, inclusive of their inner mental nature."

What is the rationale of this O.T. usage ? When mankind is spoken of as " flesh " there is expressed or implied thereby a contrast between mankind and God. Of what nature is the contrast ? It is to be noted that in the prophetical writings this antithesis is brought

* Quoted by Prof. Dickson, *St. Paul's Use of the Terms Flesh and Spirit*, p. 406.

out by definitely setting mankind as " flesh "
in contradistinction to God as "spirit."   Dr.
A. B. Davidson (*The Theology of the O.T.*, p.
190) says, " When Jehovah is called Spirit,
it is not a question of His essence, but of His
power.   And when men are spoken of as
' all flesh,' the emphasis does not fall on
what they are made of, but it rather ex-
presses a secondary idea, no doubt suggested
by this, the idea of their weakness."
Writers on O.T. theology are agreed in re-
garding a passage in Isaiah as primary in
time and importance in this conception—
" The Egyptians are men and not God ;
and their horses are flesh and not spirit "
(Isa. xxxi. 3).   The question before the
prophet was not what horses were made of,
but what they could do.   Judah needed
help.   An alliance with Egypt was mooted.
The prophet, in order to show the powerless-
ness of Egypt compared with the might of
Jahveh, sets " men " and " flesh " on the
one side, and " God " and " Spirit " on
the other.   And so in many other passages.
Wendt says, " When living beings on earth
are named flesh over against God, so far as
He works by His Spirit, we easily see that

they are so termed not as regards the distinction of their *substance* but as regards their *power* and *mode of working*."

It is important to bear this in mind when considering the N.T. use of the term " flesh " in its Pauline developments, for writers like Holsten and Pfleiderer try to read a philosophical theory of " substance " into the word. But it can be safely affirmed that, so far as the O.T. is concerned, " flesh " when applied to mankind as a whole is chosen because it fitly expresses the physical frailty of man. Wendt concludes on this point, " The word ' all flesh ' denotes living beings with the *connotation of the absolute weakness of their nature in distinction from the power and living operation of God*—a sense which we shall perhaps best express by the word creaturely."

In the N.T. the phrase " all flesh," meaning mankind collectively, occurs nine times, mostly in quotations from the O.T., " *All flesh* shall see the salvation of God," * " I will pour forth My Spirit upon *all flesh*," † " *All flesh* is as grass." ‡ Christ has au-

* Luke iii. 6.   † Acts ii. 17.
‡ 1 Pet. i. 24.

thority " over *all flesh*." *   In the Epistles
of Paul the expression " all flesh " is ren-
dered " no flesh " when occurring in a nega-
tive sentence.   " By the works of the law
shall no *flesh* be justified " (Rom. iii. 20 ;
Gal. ii. 16), " No *flesh* should glory before
God " (1 Cor. i. 29).   In all these passages
in which this phrase " all flesh " occurs, it
is very noticeable that mankind's inherent
frailty or need of divine help, or subjection
to divine authority, is implied.   " Flesh "
not only means man, but man dependent
upon God.   There is no sinful implication
in the word in this connection.   Man is
" flesh " and man is weak.   Hence we meet
with such expressions as " the infirmity of
the flesh," " weak through the flesh," " our
mortal flesh."

This conception of the inherent weakness
and perishableness of the " flesh " appears
in some passages where it is contrasted with
the " spirit," although without any ethical
disparagement such as Paul's famous anti-
thesis involves.   For instance, Jesus says to
the disciples in Gethsemane, " The spirit
indeed is willing, but the *flesh* is weak "

* John xvii. 2.

(Matt. xxvi. 41 ; Mark xiv. 38). Or again, that the " flesh " is the earthborn and the " spirit " the God-given element in man's psychological nature is implied in the words, " That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit " (John iii. 6). He that is " born of God " is contrasted with those that are " born of the will of the flesh " (John i. 13). The principle of mental life which gives insight into spiritual truth is higher than the principle of physical life within the body, " It is the spirit that quickeneth ; the flesh profiteth nothing " (John vi. 63) ; hence the mistaken notions of those to whom Christ said, " Ye judge after the flesh " (John viii. 15). Human nature is more fully expressed by the phrase " flesh and blood." It is not found in the O.T., though the expression " the life of the flesh is in the blood " comes near to it. It is found, however, in the Apocryphal and Rabbinical literature. In each instance of its use by Paul the thought of man as earthly and visible, as compared with the divine and spiritual, is implied. " Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God " (1 Cor. xv. 50), not necessarily

because of man's sin, but because man as a
mere creature cannot enter a spiritual sphere.
" I conferred not with flesh and blood " (Gal.
i. 16). Paul did not receive his message
from man who shared a common humanity
with him, but by a divine revelation. " Our
wrestling is not against flesh and blood "
(Eph. vi. 12), hence the need of the " sword
of the Spirit " in contending against unseen
spiritual adversaries.

That no evil meaning inheres in " flesh "
or " flesh and blood," as such, appears from
the many passages in which the human
nature of Christ is so designated. " The
Word became flesh " (John i. 14). Christ
was " born of the seed of David according
to the flesh " (Rom. i. 3) ; " Christ according
to the flesh " (Rom. ix. 5), " manifested in
the flesh " (1 Tim. iii. 16).

4. Flesh and Sin

The meanings expressed by the term
" flesh " considered hitherto have been lack-
ing in any ethical significance. To say that
" flesh " represents the living tissue of the
body, or the body as the outward and visible

part of man, or mankind as finite and weak, or the natural kinship between men, does not imply that it is sinful or morally blameworthy.

But what distinguishes the Pauline from other Biblical writings—viz. a fuller psychological terminology and a deeper psychological insight—is true also here. For the Apostle does undoubtedly use " flesh " in a further ethico-theological sense which brings it into close relation with the doctrine of Sin. We have to recognise that in the Pauline psychology the " flesh " is sometimes regarded as the seat of sin, the arena of its evil activity. The Apostle declares the psychological *locus* of sin's manifestation to be man's flesh. As Wendt points out, Paul's design was to set forth not the origin of sin *from* the " flesh," but the power of sin *in* the " flesh." This is apparent in Rom. vii., where the Apostle is describing the unregenerate man whose consciousness of sin has been awakened by the moral law, but who is as yet powerless to resist sin. " When we were in the flesh," he says in ver. 5, " the sinful passions " (" the passions of sins," R.V.M.) " . . . wrought in our members."

In this passage it is clear that to " be in the flesh " does not describe a fact of physical existence, but a moral experience. That experience is further described when the Apostle, viewing the state retrospectively, says, " I am carnal, sold under sin." The flesh is the part invaded by sin. Sin in it has found the weak spot in man's nature, by which to subjugate him. The sinful passions are hypostatised as the forces of evil carrying destruction and death before them into the members of the human organism. The law which is " spiritual " reveals the presence of the enemy in possession of the outer man, and makes the inner man realise that he is conquered (" sold under sin ") and powerless (" to will is present with me, but to do what is good is not "). Hence the despairing confession, " I know that in me (that is, in *my flesh*) dwelleth no good thing." The conqueror Sin imposes its own law. " So then I myself with the mind serve the law of God ; but with the *flesh* the law of sin." Here the ethical view of " flesh," as the seat of sin, is clearly brought out, and the only element in man set in contrast to it is the mind ; the

faculty of moral judgment, which is power-less to deliver man from sin's domination.

In other passages " flesh " is set over against " spirit," and this forms the great antithesis of Pauline theology. In Rom. viii. 4-13 the contrast between the " flesh " and " spirit " is worked out very fully. They that live " after the flesh " give atten-tion to the things of the " flesh." The mind of the flesh cannot be subject to the divine law, and is enmity against God. Therefore those who are living in the " flesh " cannot please God ; they do not belong to Christ, and, moreover, " to live after the flesh " is to be doomed to death. On the other hand, they that are " after the spirit " give atten-tion to the things of the spirit, and the mind of the spirit is " life " and " peace." Those that are " in the spirit," *i.e.* those in whom the Spirit of God dwelleth, are not " in the flesh," *i.e.* are not under the dominion of sin, and moreover their mortal bodies shall one day be quickened and raised up, for by the Spirit the spiritual mortify the deeds of the body and therefore shall live. To be led by the Spirit of God is to become a son of God, and to receive the Spirit of adoption.

With the self-conscious human spirit the
Divine Spirit bears witness to this fact of
" sonship," and to subsequent inheritance
of glory. In the awakened but unregenerate
man described in the seventh chapter, it is
the mind, the mind in its moral judgments,
that is opposed to " flesh," but it is power-
less. But in those who are in fellowship
with Christ, the " flesh " is not only opposed
but overcome by the Spirit—*i.e.* by the
Divine Spirit working in and through the
human spirit.

The antithesis of " flesh " and " spirit "
also occurs in the Epistle to the Galatians.
" Walk by the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil
the lusts of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth
against the Spirit, and the Spirit against
the flesh, for these are contrary the one
to the other " (Gal. v. 16, 17). Here the
dualism of Paul reaches its clearest ex-
pression, and the " flesh " is definitely identi-
fied with the sinful nature of men, while the
" spirit " is the man's new regenerate nature
under the direct influence of the Holy
Spirit. The question here arises as to the
nature of the Biblical dualism between
" flesh " and " spirit " which comes to

clearest expression in the writings of Paul.
A very interesting and important controversy
arose over this question some years ago,
when it was maintained by a brilliant group
of German writers, including Baur, Holsten,
Lüdemann, and Pfleiderer, that Paul's doc-
trine as to the relation of " flesh " and
" spirit " showed that he was under the
influence of Greek philosophy. They held
that the Pauline antithesis was at bottom
metaphysical, and that " flesh " and
" spirit " were regarded by Paul as two
distinct " substances " which in their very
nature were antagonistic one to the other.
Hence the term " flesh " can only mean in
the Pauline Epistles the principle of sin in
man and that it consists in sensuousness or
sensuality.*

The main position held by these writers
has been criticised by Wendt, Dickson, and
other writers in England and America, and
after the battle that has been waged over
this vexed question the results may well
be stated in the words of Sanday and

---

* Pfleiderer's views, which are the most moderate, are
accessible to English readers in his Hibbert Lectures and
in his work *Paulinism*.

Headlam : " The controversy may be now regarded as practically closed. Its result is summed up by Lipsius in these decisive words : The Pauline anthropology rests entirely on an O.T. base ; the elements in it which are supposed to be derived from Hellenistic dualism must simply be denied." * This judgment is in accord with that of Dr. E. P. Gould in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* (article " Flesh "), who remarks that in the present state of the question it is enough to say that the rationale of Paul's theory of sin " is probably not the Greek dualism which affirms evil of matter as such."

The general results of the discussion have gone to prove that the supposed influence of Greek philosophy on the Pauline doctrine of the " flesh " has been overestimated. Up to his conversion to Christianity Paul had been a Pharisee, and Pharisaism opposed Hellenism. As a Christian Apostle he treated contemptuously the claims of Greek philosophy to bring men to a knowledge of divine truth (1 Cor. i. 20-31). His Gospel was not primarily an appeal to Reason, but

* *Romans* (*Int. Crit. Com.*), p. 181.

he claimed that his preaching was " in demonstration of the Spirit and of power " (1 Cor. ii. 4). He was very anxious that the faith of his converts should not be based on the " wisdom of men," but on the " power of God." His aim was not to harmonise Christian teaching with Greek thought, but to fuse Judaism and Christianity more particularly.

The dualistic theory of matter as essentially evil does not determine Paul's doctrine of " flesh." To apply the category of " substance " to either " flesh " or " spirit " is to profoundly mistake the nature of the Pauline antithesis. The contrast is not metaphysical, but ethical. To assume a metaphysical view of " flesh " as matter is to read into the Apostolic language the concepts of later thought, and, further, to regard it as essentially evil is to do violence to Paul's strongly Jewish view that all things were created by God and therefore good. The contrast between " flesh " and " spirit " is not a contrast of " substance," the one being material and the other (relatively) immaterial, but it is the usual Scriptural contrast between the human and

the divine. Laidlaw urges that to under-
stand the Pauline antithesis we must dismiss
the Greek antithesis of substance and " sub-
stitute for it the proper Biblical antithesis—
earthly and heavenly, natural and super-
natural, that flesh is what nature evolves,
and spirit what God in His grace bestows."

Paul's general view of the body is op-
posed to the dualistic conception. It is
not a prison-house of the soul, but a temple
or sanctuary of the Spirit (1 Cor. iii. 16, 17,
vi. 19), it is that in and through which the
Holy Spirit manifests Himself. The body
can be made " a living sacrifice, holy, accept-
able to God " (Rom. xii. 1), for under the
Christian dispensation the body is " for the
Lord " (1 Cor. vi. 13), and our bodies are
" members of Christ " (1 Cor. vi. 15).

The members of the body wherein rules
the power of sin (Rom. vii. 5, 23) are
capable of being " instruments of righteous-
ness unto God " (Rom. vi. 13). The very
flesh may be cleansed with the spirit from
all defilements (2 Cor. vii. 1). Moreover, the
body is to be transfigured and raised in
the Resurrection by the Spirit (Rom. viii.
11). It is to share in the redemption

through Christ. Just as sin and the punishment of sin are localised in the human body, so redemption extends to man's body, which shall share in the glory of the new life in Christ, for with Paul the body was a necessary constituent of the personality. In his earlier writings, when the hopes of an imminent Parousia of the Christ were universal among Christians, Paul prays, " May your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ " (1 Thess. v. 23). The body was to form part of the Christian personality to share in the experience of the second coming of Christ.

Later on in the ministry of the Apostle, when death had already claimed the bodies of many Christians, and some began to question the possibility of a resurrection, Paul taught the doctrine of a " spiritual body " fitted to become the organ of the new life. At death, he says, " Thou sowest not the body that shall be " (1 Cor. xv. 37); moreover, " flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God " (ver. 50), and yet man, when raised from the dead, will have a body. To speak of it as a " spiritual body "

is not to describe its substance, as **Pfleiderer** and others have maintained. Not what the body-to-be is made of concerns the Apostle, but the necessity of a body even in the next life and its adaptability to be the organ of the spiritual life. This present organism embodies soul (is " natural " or soulish) ; the organism of the next life will embody the spirit (will be spiritual or pneumatical.) But there is a body in each case.

Dr. Charles says, " Between the bodies there is no exact continuity. The existence of the one depends on the death of the other. Nevertheless, there is some essential likeness between them. The essential likeness proceeds from the fact that they are successive expressions of the same personality, though in different spheres " (*Encyclopædia Biblica*, vol. ii. article " Eschatology ").

In 2 Cor. iv. 16 the decay of " the outward man " is again in the Apostle's thoughts. But the idea of being " unclothed " at death—the idea of a bodiless immortality— is abhorrent to Paul, and so he says, " In this (body) we groan, longing to be clothed upon with our habitation which is from

heaven " (2 Cor. v. 2). So at death we have
an immortal body which is the gift of God.
In Paul's eschatological teaching in regard
to the body a development of thought can
be traced, but at each stage the one convic-
tion that remains is that the personality will
be embodied personality even after death.

We may conclude by saying that Paul
distinguishes between sin and flesh. They
are closely associated but distinct. It is
true that Paul clearly teaches that the
principle of sin dwells in man and that it
finds in man's flesh its sphere of influence.
But to admit that sin finds in the weakness
of the flesh its opportunity, or in its impulses
and appetites its occasion, is not to say that
flesh in itself is sinful. Paul does not even
say that sin has its origin in the flesh. It
has its historical origin in the first disobe-
dience of Adam (Rom. viii. 3-9), and man's
hereditary depravity comes as a natural
inheritance through the flesh. When Adam
and Christ are compared (1 Cor. xv. 45), the
contrast is not between one as sinful and
the other as holy, but between the first as
natural (soulish), earthy, and the second as
spiritual and heavenly, and this in accord

with the Pauline view that Adam was originally sinless (Rom. v. 12). The close relationship of sin and flesh recognised by the Apostle springs more from the result of experience than from speculation as to the psychological origin of sin. Dr. Stevens says (*Theology of the N.T.* p. 345), " In what Paul says of the ' flesh ' he is speaking entirely of empirical humanity as it is since the entrance of sin into the world. He does not represent man as, originally and by his constitution, sinful. On the contrary, he became sinful by an act of will. But he was by creation carnal, he had a lower nature whose appetites and passions readily entered into alliance with depraved affection and a perverted will."

Nor can it be said that the sin associated with " flesh " is chiefly sensuality. Many sins, according to Paul, are non-sensuous in nature. Among the fifteen " works of the flesh " enumerated in Gal. v. 19-22, only five can be strictly called sensuous ; while such sins as " enmity, jealousies, wraths, heresies," are clearly non-sensuous. To be " carnal " may be to indulge in " jealousy and strife " (1 Cor. iii. 3). The Apostle

recognises a defilement of the "spirit" (2 Cor. vii. 1), and he speaks of sinful desires " of the mind " as well as of the "flesh" (Eph. ii. 3). In view of such Pauline language it is inadmissible to suppose that sin is essentially " sensuality " based on a dualism which regards matter as evil. Paul actually contends with dualistic teaching and speaks of the " fleshly " mind of the Gnostic ascetics (Col. ii. 18), who despised the body as evil. Similarly Greek philosophy is regarded as "fleshly wisdom" (1 Cor. i. 22, 26).

Concerning the Pauline or ethical sense of " flesh," Dr. Hort remarks, " Two points specially need attention with respect to it. On the one hand 'flesh,' according to St. Paul, includes much more than sensuality, as a glance at Gal. v. 19 *ff.* is enough to show ; for such things as hatreds, factiousness, and envyings are members of a list which begins with fornication and ends with drunkennesses and revellings. On the other hand, the term ' flesh ' is not applied to any part of human nature absolutely and in itself, but as placed in a wrong relation, that being allowed to rule which was made and

meant to serve. Except in implied anti-
thesis to ' spirit,' this sense of ' flesh ' has
no meaning." *

Finally, Paul held both the sinlessness of
Christ and the reality of his body. Even
the very word " flesh " is used to describe
his nature on the human side. He was
born " according to the flesh," " manifested
in the flesh." Paul's ethical use of the term
" flesh " is well expressed in the words of
Dr. Stevens (*Theol. of New Testament*, p.
34), " Metaphysically considered, the flesh
is neutral ; empirically considered, it is
sinful. Matter, as such, is not evil ; but the
body, as animated by a soul capable of
feelings and appetites, is a source of temp-
tation and a seat of evil."

The foregoing review makes abundantly
clear that St. Paul's ethical use of " flesh "
and " spirit," while not involving Greek
dualism, is an advance on the usual Biblical
meaning of the term. He sharpens the
antithesis between them by almost entirely
appropriating " spirit " for the Holy Spirit
of God in regenerate man and by using the
term " flesh " to signify that wherein sin

* See Commentary on 1 Peter.

dwells in antagonism to God. The language of the Apostle in this respect reflects his own religious experience and that of the early Christians. It expresses both the spiritual height to which the human personality can rise in fellowship with Christ and also the sinful depth to which it can descend when under the power of evil. It also makes clear that even in the regenerate there continues a state of conflict, but that the Holy Spirit in man may conquer the power of inborn sin.

Before leaving this subject it may well be asked whether the ethical interpretation of " flesh " is confined to the Pauline writings. The only place where a clear reference to it occurs is in 1 Pet. ii. 11, where we read, " Beloved, I beseech you as sojourners and pilgrims, to abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul." Here the word " fleshly " undoubtedly carries with it the strictly Pauline sense. In other places the association of " flesh " with lust, or desire in an evil sense (2 Pet. ii. 10, 18 ; 1 John ii. 16) suggests an ethical view which approaches the Pauline usage. But apart from these instances, on which

no great weight can be laid, the N.T. writings (except the Pauline) agree in regarding " flesh " as synonymous with " body " or as an expression for human nature in its creaturely aspects of weakness and perishableness.

PART II

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL EXPERIENCES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER VI

" MAN is not man as yet," sings Robert Browning, tuned to the recurrent note in the teaching of Jesus concerning man, which sounds throughout the first three Gospels. But these early records contain, in addition, details about the actions of Jesus and his actual relationships to living men which afford us significant psychological data suggesting the nature and possibilities of human personality. It is only through the recognition of the facts embodied in these narratives that we get the clue to the fuller psychological terminology and deeper anthropological conceptions of the other N.T. writings, which represent the subjects of Christian experience as reflecting on the meaning of that experience. The Christian character and the Christian life did not, in the first instance, spring out of the reflections of Paul or John or any other

of the N.T. writers. Religion does not spring from or primarily depend upon theology. Theology follows religion. Or rather, in the close interaction of religion and theology (as in the intimate correlation of life and thought) the facts of experience emerge first and give thought its content. The subconscious precedes the conscious, and the conscious at last becomes self-conscious. As thought co-ordinates that which is given subconsciously, it certainly prepares the way for a yet fuller experience. But the religion of the primitive Christians is first a life, an experience. It has a spontaneity that does not wait on reason, and that impresses its earliest subjects with a sense of the supernatural. This varied and bewildering psychic material is then reflected upon, and reason seeks to discover its origin, its meaning, and its worth. The religious experience is something given. It is of grace, and simply to be received by faith. It comes from God ; and out of man's newly discovered relation to God springs theology proper. The Pauline literature represents mature reflection on the earliest experiences of the Christian

religion, and therefore embodies a developed system of doctrine. The Synoptics, on the other hand, afford us an account of the conditions under which the first experiences of the Christian religion took place in human life and society. But Christian experience itself sprang ultimately from the personality of Jesus. Like Socrates before him, Jesus wrote no book. He selected personality as the realm in which to lodge his bequest to the world. The men who became his disciples did not simply listen to his teaching ; their characters were permeated by his spirit, and they reproduced, in some measure, the life which he imparted. For this reason the personality of Jesus and the immediate influences which he exerted on other personalities are psychological facts to be examined in the interests of human personality generally.

1. Jesus and Man in the Synoptic Gospels

The N.T. is a literature that gathers round a person.* Christianity is a religion

* " In the New Testament we do not find dogmatic discussions of human nature and its problems, any more than in the Old. . . . What we do find is a new centre,

10

that springs from an historic person, and that is based on the personal relationship of man to God which Jesus made possible. Any philosophic view of human personality which left out the contribution made to the subject by the N.T. presentation of the historical Jesus would be greatly impoverished, especially on the religious side of the question. With the theological explanation of the personality of Jesus, or even with the Christological doctrines of the N.T. writers, we are not here concerned. But it is for us briefly to inquire : Do the memorabilia of Jesus contained in the first three Gospels afford any light on what man is in himself, or on what man may become under certain conditions of life ? Here we begin simply with the assumption that Jesus is an historic person. In the Synoptic Gospels he is pictured as truly man. The Gospel of Mark—on the whole our

around which the ideas of the Old Testament, as modified by the later Judaism, can arrange themselves in all their fluidity, the time of dogmatic crystallisation not yet having come. This new centre is the personality of Jesus, around whom all the problems of God and man ultimately gather " (Prof. Wheeler Robinson, *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, p. 75).

earliest written record—is particularly full
of vivid human details, but the other
Synoptics add suggestive touches of the
same order to the picture. Yet this truly
human portraiture in the primitive record
only throws into greater relief two psycho-
logical elements in his personality which
demand special mention.

1. The *religious* consciousness of Jesus.
The whole of the Synoptic narrative is per-
vaded with the idea of the intimate fellow-
ship which Jesus had with the Divine. His
earthly life seems to have been character-
ised by unbroken communion with God.
Corresponding   to   this   was   exceptional
power, both spiritual and physical, to
minister to human need—power which he
describes as " authority " and traces to his
special relationship to God, and that, seem-
ingly, as the archetypal man (Mark ii. 6-10 ;
cf. Matt. vii. 29, xii. 28 *f.* ; Luke xi. 20).

2. The *moral* consciousness of Jesus.
While Jesus' self-consciousness included a
personal and intimate relationship to God
as his Father, his self-determination was
marked by perfect conformity to the will
of God, both active and passive. " Not

what I will, but what Thou wilt " (Mark
xiv. 36) was the unbroken law of his life,
from the Temptation even unto the Cross.
The Synoptics record no charge of sin
brought against the moral character of
Jesus by his enemies. They record no act
in his life that can be morally challenged.
Nor do they record any saying of Jesus
which reflects consciousness of sin on his
part. The saintliest of other lives, known
to us, betray some consciousness of sin—
nay, this consciousness has generally been
in proportion to the saintliness ; but in the
self-revelation which the words of Jesus
furnish there is no hint of any conscious-
ness of sinfulness. Further, the impression
which the human personality of Jesus makes
is not one of mere negative sinlessness,
but also of positive goodness. So that we
may say that the perfect personality which
the N.T. reflects is one in which the will is
surrendered to the will of God, not merely
in passive submission, but in active obedi-
ence ; one in which all self-determination
becomes God-determination ; and one in
which the moral and religious ideal is the
supremacy of God through the willing

obedience and active co-operation of man.
Thus the N.T. furnishes in Jesus the realised
ideal of human moral perfection—this as
reflecting the Divine character itself ; ac-
cording to his own words, " Ye shall be
perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect."

2.   The Fatherhood of God

Jesus brought man into personal relation-
ship to God by his distinctive teaching
of the Fatherhood of God.   The N.T. idea
of human personality is inseparable from
its doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, for
man is conceived of as in closest relationship
to God.   In this respect the N.T. makes
an advance upon the O.T.   The O.T. had
already taught the unity of God, His
personality and spirituality.

Prof. A. B. Davidson says, " Unquestion-
ably the most distinct and strongly marked
conception in regard to God in the O.T.
is that of His personality.   This appears on
every page " (*The Theology of the O.T.* p.
106).   It also taught that man was created
in the divine image.   But in later Judaism
the transcendence of God came to be
emphasised.   With the advent of Christ

God was brought near to men in love. God was not merely one, personal, holy, transcendent. He was Father. There are many anticipations of this teaching in Hebrew literature, but the Fatherhood of God forms the unique revelation of Jesus as to God and His relationship to men.

While Jesus has nothing to say as to the biological origin of man, he is emphatic in declaring the divine origin of man—his spiritual derivation from a personal and loving God. Jesus speaks of God as " the Father " many times in his sayings, without any qualifying pronoun. At other times, when enforcing love and mercy, he speaks of God as " your Father." The disciples are directed to address God in prayer as " Father." The very nature of prayer, as Christ understood it, was entering into the closest and most intimate communion with God. Prayer was not an attempt to batter down the unwillingness of God by vain repetitions, as in the case of the Baal worshippers on Carmel, or by importunity, as in the case of the widow before the unjust judge; it is going to the " inner chamber," " closing the door," and

praying to " your Father " who shall recompense.

While wishing to hold the uniqueness of the " sonship " of Jesus, we must not overlook his teaching as to the sonship of man as such. Human personality is a reflex of the Divine Personality. What a flood of light the N.T. thus throws upon the question of personality when, assuming the O.T. doctrine that man was created in the image of God, it advances to the thought that man as such, and especially man governed by a life of love, is akin to the Personal God, because man in his human personality is a son of the Father. If self-consciousness is the distinctive element in personality (as most modern thinkers hold), then Jesus enhanced the self-consciousness of man to an immeasurable degree by asserting the Fatherhood of God and its personal corollary—the sonship of man.

3. The Inherent Worth of Human Personality

In the O.T. the nation is the unit. The man is subordinated to the community. His value and welfare are identified with the

moral condition and material prosperity
of the Covenant people. But when the
nation is threatened with destruction, there
emerges in Jeremiah and more so in Ezekiel
the significance and responsibility of the
individual. In the Apocalyptic literature
man's individual immortality is also taught.
This prophetic development in regard to
man comes to full expression in the teaching
of Jesus. His views as to the moral worth
and possibility of human personality are
seen from the fact that he recognised the
value of the life of every individual as such.
This was the deep-seated assumption that
gave point to his exhortation against
anxiety, " Be not anxious . . . behold the
birds of the heaven . . . are not ye of
much more value than they ? " (Matt. vi.
25, 26 ; Luke xii. 24). It may be contended
that these words are only applicable to the
disciples to whom the foregoing words were
immediately addressed. But this objection
is swept away by our Lord's argument for
the right to heal on the Sabbath day (Matt.
vii. 12). The most sacred institution among
the Jews is subservient to the interests and
welfare of man—" The Sabbath was made

for man " (Mark ii. 27)—for its establish-
ment was an expression of the love of God
to mankind.   The intrinsic worth of man
rests on his filial relationship to God, and
the recognition of this personal, though
potential, worth of man is basal in our Lord's
teaching.   He asserted also the moral rights
of woman as never had been done before in
Judaism.   The assertion of right rests on
the prior assumption of worth.   The Jewish
doctors of the time held the view current
in older Hebrew times that woman was a
chattel, the property of man, to be bought
or sold at pleasure.   But Jesus claimed on
behalf of woman that she should only be
put away for adulterous unfaithfulness when,
ipso facto, she had put herself away (Matt.
xix. 3-9).   He thus indirectly asserted that
it was woman's worth as a person that gave
her a claim to both the humanity and justice
of man.   The tender regard that Jesus had
for children is another indication of his
recognition of the possibilities lying within
humanity.   His indignation was stirred by
the action of those who would have kept
the children from him (Mark x. 14).   He
saw in children the qualities of helplessness,

openness to new impressions, and comparative innocence, that give entrance to the Kingdom of Heaven (Matt. xviii. 3). Further, both by his teaching and his actions, Jesus brought to human consciousness the fact that even the sinner has worth in God's sight. The term of reproach—(" a friend of publicans and sinners ")—applied to Jesus reveals a true discernment of his purpose in relation to the outcasts. He desired to awaken in them a consciousness of God's love for them. Our Lord did not justify his action, in the face of criticism, on any lower ground than to declare it the expression of the love of the Father. The parables of the lost sheep, of the lost coin, and of the lost son constitute what has been called the Apologia of Jesus for his attitude of love towards the worst of sinners. They might well be regarded as " lost," but there was the possibility of their being recovered and saved.

4. The Gospel of the Kingdom

With this message the ministry of Jesus began. John had announced the near approach of a personal Messiah. Jesus,

when he appeared, proclaimed as the gospel of God the near approach of the Messianic kingdom—" the time is fulfilled and the Kingdom of God is at hand " (Mark i. 15). The good of the individual was to be realised only in and through a divinely ordained fellowship. The *summum bonum* is " the Kingdom," and to seek it is the chief end of man, for The Good is at once individual and social. Hence his exhortations to " seek first the Kingdom of God " (Matt. vi. 33). " He who so seeks the highest good," says Dr. Bruce, commenting on this ethical view of the message of Jesus, " fulfils at the same time the highest duty of man. In the coincidence of the chief good with chief end lies the unique distinction of the Christian religion as expounded by its Founder."* It is called the Kingdom " of God " or " of Heaven " to mark its origin and attributes. It will fulfil the Jewish ideal of a theocracy. Its laws will express the will of God. And so when the disciples were taught to pray " Thy Kingdom come," they were taught to pray also for that through which alone the heavenly ideal will be realised on earth,

* *Enc. Bib.* vol. ii. c. 2443.

" Thy will be done as in heaven so in earth "
(Matt. vi. 10).

Dalman (*The Words of Jesus*, p. 136) says
that Jesus " considered it certain that the
chief end of mankind was to find their
salvation in the most intimate relation to
God in full obedience to His will."

Although there is a large eschatological
element in the teaching of Jesus concerning
the Kingdom, yet the central distinct feature
is, that the Kingdom is realisable in the
present. In contrast to the national ex-
pectation of a merely Jewish theocracy,
it was to be a universal sovereignty of God.
It was not to consist in material good, but
in spiritual. This present, spiritual, and
universal nature of the Kingdom revealed
it as a realm in which human personalities
would attain the highest good in a personal
relationship to God and in fellowship with
men. Hence Jesus took up the current
Apocalyptic conception of the Messianic
age as a feast and applied it to the Kingdom
(Matt. xxii. 1-14). Dalman says, " Even
for Jesus this repast was no mere figure of
speech. But he speaks of it in plain lan-
guage for the purpose *of emphasising the*

fellowship which the righteous of all ages
are destined to enjoy."

It is noticeable in this connection that,
immediately after announcing the approach
of the Kingdom, Jesus selected a band of
disciples (Mark i. 16-20), which ultimately
became the apostolic company of the twelve
(Mark iii. 14-19).   These he associated with
himself in the work of preaching and healing,
sending them out "by two and two"
(Mark vi. 7).

That little band was the microcosm in
which was anticipated the personal fellow-
ship of the macrocosm of the coming King-
dom.

5.   THE HEALING MINISTRY OF JESUS

Harnack says, " Our Lord's ministry of
healing appears as his characteristic work "
(*Sayings of Jesus*, p. 216).

In the Synoptics the healing ministry of
Jesus occupies a conspicuous place.   What-
ever view may be held as to the miraculous-
ness of Christ's healing ministry, little doubt
can exist as to the fact.   And the fact only
concerns us here, as it throws light on the

personality of Jesus, and on the question of human personality in general.

In the case of our Lord himself, his acts of healing afford impressive data as to (1) his spiritual power ; (2) his deep sympathy with all sufferers ; (3) his care for the whole man. They are a revelation of depths and resources within his own personality that modern psychology is only just beginning to recognise. They are manifestations of divine energy. They were not performed to excite wonder, nor indeed in response to demands for a sign. But they were an expression of the goodwill. " I will—be thou made clean " (Mark i. 41). Among the diseases which Jesus healed were many mental or nervous ailments. In the treatment of these the personality of the Master would be a potent influence in producing the cure. He summoned the sufferer's own faith into activity or welcomed the faith of others as a factor in effecting the cure. In Nazareth he could do no mighty works because of their unbelief.

Of special importance psychologically are the cases of demonic possession. Jesus undoubtedly acted and spoke in accordance

with the contemporary Jewish belief as to
the actual existence and malevolent power
of evil spirits or demons.   But in marked
contrast to the elaborate and magical per-
formances of ancient exorcists, it is to be
noted that Jesus effected cures of this
kind by his personal authority and power.
Victims of demonic possession were most
probably sufferers from some physical or
psychical disorders who yet were amenable
to treatment which seemed to cast out some
sub-personal agency that subjugated the
personality of the patient.

Now, modern psychology recognises the
existence of abnormal mutations of the
self, such as alterations of the memory,
split personality, and even mediumship
(James, *Textbook of Psychology*, pp. 206-16 ;
F. W. H. Myers, *Human Personality*, vol. i.
pp. 34-69).

The personality may be so disintegrated
that the self seems to be replaced by one or
more other selves.   These abnormal psychic
states have been called Diseases of Per-
sonality.   They are often induced by sug-
gestion and may frequently be cured by
suggestion.   Amongst people who believe

in possession, any consciousness of mental disturbance would naturally be attributed to demons, and the sufferer would then act as though controlled by a demon. The most potent counter-suggestion in curing such a case would be to command the spirit to come out. Such methods have been used successfully by modern missionaries amongst people who still believe in demonic possession.

For our purpose, the cases of demonic possession recorded in the Synoptics (even supposing that they include insanity and epilepsy) may be regarded as diseases of personality which Christ cured. In every case the human personality of the sufferer was rid of its invading and disintegrating sub-personality or sub-personalities, and restored to self-possession and self-control by restoring the true self to its rightful supremacy. They bear witness, therefore, both to the commanding personality of Jesus and to the unification of personality which he effected in others. Jesus regarded man as capable of such unity of self-consciousness and self-determination that he treated as unlawful intruders such disorders as broke

up that unity and he delivered men from them. Autonomous personality was a priceless boon that men should not be deprived of, either by disease or superstition—a *sine qua non* to the inauguration of the Kingdom of God, wherein the will of God should be done in and by men (Luke xi. 20).

6. The Future of Personality

As to the future of personality after death, the Synoptics afford two important considerations—the teaching of Jesus, and the record of his resurrection. Jesus assumes the future existence of man (Matt. viii. 11 ; Luke xxiii. 43, xvi. 22), especially of the righteous (Matt. xxiv. 31 ; Luke xiv. 14). The belief was general among the Jews, and it was only in opposition to the Sadducees, who denied the Resurrection, that Jesus formally stated a reason for believing in it. The Sadducees had challenged belief in a resurrection by stating a case which seemed to make it an absurdity (Matt. xxii. 23-32 ; Mark xii. 18-27 ; Luke xx. 27-40). The reply of Jesus is to the effect that the Sadducees misunderstood the nature of the resurrection life by supposing it to be

11

sensuous, and that the resurrection is based on man's relationship to God and kinship with Him.

Jehovah was called " the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob " because He not only *was* their God but still *is*. He is the God of the living. Death does not interrupt the relationship in which man stands to God. But the greatest light is thrown upon the future of human personality in the Synoptics by the Resurrection of Jesus. The doctrinal implications of that event are worked out in the other N.T. writings, but the Synoptics contain the record of the fact. And it was upon the belief in its occurrence that the early Apostles went forth and preached, through Jesus, the resurrection of the dead and, as bound up therewith, the continuance of personality. " If Christ has not been raised," says Paul to the Corinthians, " then is our preaching vain and your faith also is vain " (1 Cor. xv. 14). In a word, the Synoptic record of the resurrection of Jesus put the future of human personality into a new perspective for the early Christians, and formed the basis of a N.T. doctrine which differs from all other ancient views as to

immortality. According to this, Jesus in his teaching presupposes a continuance of the life of the individual, grounding it on man's essential kinship with God ; and, in his own Resurrection, gave conclusive proof of the victory of personality over death.

.

CHAPTER VII

THE CONVERSION OF PAUL

AN examination of the psychological ter-
minology of the books of the N.T. has
shown a modification and development of
Biblical language running through these
writings. The O.T. terminology largely
sufficed for the writers of the Synoptics,
but the Crucifixion and Resurrection of Jesus
with which these records end, and the gift
of the Spirit at Pentecost with which the
apostolic history opens, marked a turning-
point in the spiritual experience of believers,
and an enriched psychological terminology
was found necessary to express the fuller life
that followed. The worth of human per-
sonality which had been taught by Jesus
as he unfolded his teaching about God and
the Kingdom, as he healed and cared for the
bodies of men, as he pointed the souls of

164

men along the path of the higher righteous-
ness of purity and love, was only potential
so far.   Nevertheless, he sealed his esti-
mate by the Cross. That the insight of
Jesus was also foresight appeared imme-
diately after Pentecost.   The fruits of his
Passion now ripened in human nature.   The
intrinsic worth of human personality now
became extrinsic.   The hidden potentiality
which Jesus discerned now became mani-
fested power. Consequently men began to
view themselves in a new light, both as to
their previous condition under sin and as
to their changed condition in fellowship with
Christ.   One of the first to experience and
express the change was Saul of Tarsus, who
became Paul the missionary.   But the N.T.
is full of these spiritual experiences.

If the psychological language of the N.T.
has given us some indication as to the
changes that were taking place, an ex-
amination of the experiences themselves will
afford us psychological data for estimating
what the human personality may attain to
under Christian and spiritual conditions.
The spiritual crisis which often marked the
entrance of men into the Christian life

demands our first attention. It is usually called Conversion—especially when it is of dramatic suddenness. In Acts many instances of such conversions are recorded. When we remember the three thousand people converted at Pentecost, the additional thousands that believed a few days later after the healing of the lame man, the case of the Ethiopian eunuch, the transformation of the Philippian gaoler, and many others, we can appreciate the judgment of Dr. Benjamin Jowett that among the believers conversion was " almost always sudden." As the experience of Paul is the most notable of all, and as it was of such stupendous importance in the history of Christianity, it will suffice if we take his as illustrative of what took place in many of these cases of sudden conversion.

1. Narrative and Interpretation

The N.T. contains two sources of information about the Conversion of Paul, viz. the Book of Acts, and the personal testimony of Paul contained in his Epistles.

Three accounts of the event are given in Acts—that which forms part of the narra-

tive of the book itself (Acts ix. 1-19), that reported to have been given by the Apostle in Jerusalem from the castle stairs (xxii. 6-21), and that which he gave in his defence before Agrippa (xxvi. 12-18).

These three accounts differ in some particulars, but they agree as to the main points in the event as a spiritual crisis. Hatch * says that the differences " do not constitute a valid argument against the general truth of the narrative."

The Pauline Epistles contain a number of short references to it. In none of his writings, however, has Paul given a detailed account of his conversion. He only refers to it in connection with some other subject under consideration, and therefore does not describe it minutely. But it is for him the great fact that lies behind his spiritual experience, his doctrine, and his preaching. To the Galatians, while maintaining the authority and validity of his presentation of the Gospel, he writes, " It is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ" (i. 11, 12);

* *Enc. Bib.* vol. iii. c. 3608.

and again, in referring more specifically to his conversion, he says, " It was the good pleasure of God . . . to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach among the Gentiles " (i. 16).   To the Corinthians he writes, " Am I not an apostle ? *have I not seen Jesus our Lord ?* " (1 Cor. ix. 1) ; and again, when speaking of the Resurrection and of the appearance of Christ to the disciples and others, he says, " Last of all . . . he *appeared to me also* " (1 Cor. xv. 8).

The words " he appeared to me " must bear the same significance as the words " he appeared to Cephas " and " he appeared to James," which occur later in the narrative.   Paul was convinced that the appearance to himself of the risen Christ was of the same kind as that to the others whom he mentions.

These passages make clear that Paul was convinced of two things : he had seen the Christ ; he was called to be an Apostle. In a recent work by Weinel (*St. Paul*, p. 77) we read, " Saul set out from Jerusalem to Damascus as a persecutor of Christians. When he got to Damascus the Pharisee had become a believing Christian, the per-

secutor an Apostle of Jesus. What had happened ? '' The question '' What had happened ? '' is one that has challenged the attention of the world since the introduction of Christianity.

The answers that have been given by many modern writers depend largely upon the temperament and philosophical tendencies of the writers themselves, and reveal a great variety of opinion. A conservative and reverent expositor, Prof. J. J. Findlay, says,* '' The conversion of Saul is a psychological and ethical problem, the solution of which is to be found only in the actual appearance of Jesus Christ to his senses on the way to Damascus, as he believed this to have taken place.'' Writers of the '' Tübingen school,'' such as Baur (*Paul*, E.T. vol. i. 76), regard the narratives as a figurative description, in terms only of history, of the manifestation of Christ to the soul of Paul, and his subsequent change from spiritual darkness to light. Pfleiderer in the beginning of his exposition of Paulinism seeks to find a purely psychological explanation of the conversion. He offers

* Hastings' *Dict. Bib.* article '' Paul,'' vol. iii.

us one which he believes also to contain the germ of Paul's characteristic doctrines. " The peculiar gospel of Paul," says Pfleiderer (*Paulinism*, vol. i. p. 7), " was the development of the central idea of the expiatory death of Christ," and he contends that the idea of the crucified Messiah would explain the fact of the close connection between the conversion of Paul and his call to be the " Apostle of the Gentiles," for it would imply that the Jewish law was abrogated, and therefore the mission to the heathen was a logical necessity. The idea of the crucified Messiah would also explain the psychological process which led up to the conversion. Pfleiderer supposes that while a persecutor Paul would often have argued with Christians, who would appeal to two things—the prophecies that spoke of the sufferings of the Messiah (such as Isa. liii.), and the appearances of Christ after his Resurrection. As an exegete he could not deny the Scripture proof, as a Pharisee he could not deny the possibility of a resurrection. Then would follow a feeling of revulsion against the idea of a crucified Messiah. But what if the Messianic sal-

vation was really a gift of God? Could those Christians who suffered and even died, like Stephen, really be conscious liars? Doubt said No! against the idea of a crucified Messiah, and Yes! to the testimony of Scripture and the witness of the martyrs.

Here, says Pfleiderer, was " a situation which it was impossible for a sensitive spirit to endure long." Out of this conflict of thought and feeling the conversion took place. That the decision arrived at should take the form of a sensuous experience quite agrees with what happened on similar occasions. " He was subject to visions." " At momentous crises in his life the decisive resolution, after previous excitement, assumes the form of external revelation." " He would have the image of Christ glorified and raised to heaven already in his mind, since the death of Stephen. Thus the decisive turn of his conviction clothed itself in the form of the sudden appearance before him, as an objective reality. The struggle was over, every doubt was vanquished, Jesus was Messiah, not *in spite* of the Cross (as the Jewish Christians said), but because of the Cross."

Pfleiderer anticipates the objection that his theory makes the conversion (in addition to his Apostleship) spring from an idea (viz. that of the crucified and risen Messiah) by saying, " The process of conversion was anything but a cold calculation of thought ; it was, on the contrary, the deeply moral act of obedience of a tender conscience to the higher truth that forced itself upon him."

2.   Criticism of Pfleiderer's Theory

Some points in Pfleiderer's account are open to criticism from an historical standpoint. This is supplied by Weizsäcker (*Apostolic Age*, vol. i.), who does not, however, mention Pfleiderer. Weizsäcker maintains that Paul's words (Gal. i. 1, 12) are " so definite that they preclude any previous direct intercourse with Christians " (p. 82). Again, he says that Paul " was not conscious of any exertion of his own judgment, of any independent examination of the faith or decision upon it. He knew of no transition stage in which his mind hesitated and questioned." Weizsäcker contends that the revelation broke in upon Paul suddenly and unexpectedly, at once deciding everything

for him.   Nor does he allow that the fact
of the Crucifixion was decisive in bringing
about the change.   " The Resurrection was
of central importance in the incident of his
call to be an Apostle " (p. 83).   " It is
certain that it was a manifestation of Christ
which first and of itself brought him to
believe in Christ."   " He believed that Jesus
was the Messiah from the moment he be-
came convinced that Jesus had risen."

The above criticisms, so applicable to
Pfleiderer's views, need to be further ex-
amined.   Weizsäcker presses the application
of Gal. i. 1 too far.   The words " Paul,
an apostle, (not from man, neither through
man, but through Jesus Christ, and God the
Father, who raised him from the dead,) "
refer only to the question of the validity of
his Apostleship.   The words in verse 12
have reference only to the derivation of the
Gospel which Paul preached.   " Neither did
I receive it from man, nor was I taught it,
but it came to me through revelation of
Jesus Christ."   The Apostle is maintaining
that both his office of Apostle and his
Gospel he received directly from Jesus

Christ. They can hardly be used to prove
that Paul did not have " any direct inter-
course with Christians " on the subject of
the death and resurrection of their Lord.

Pfleiderer, on the other hand, has no
Scriptural ground for assuming that Paul
debated with the Christians about either
the Crucifixion or the Resurrection.
Another point mentioned by Weizsäcker
is correct, if we have to depend upon any
recorded statement. There certainly is no
record of Paul having exercised his own
judgment or of making an examination of
the faith held by the Christians. Nor is
there any record of a transition stage of
hesitation and questioning. Pfleiderer and
others may have made too much of the stage
of doubt, but the probabilities are that Paul
did think over and examine the beliefs of
the people he persecuted, if, as Weizsäcker
admits, " it is self-evident that he was not
without information as to the doctrines of
the Christians." Again, Weizsäcker's con-
tention is historically sound when he says
that it was the manifestation of the risen
Christ which first and of itself brought Paul
to believe in Christ. But when he says that

Paul " believed that Jesus was the Messiah from the moment he became convinced that Jesus had risen," he does not attempt to trace the logical process by which Paul got from the fact of the Resurrection to the conclusion of his Messiahship. Pfleiderer, in this respect, does more justice to the psychological steps that led from the one to the other. Weizsäcker further says, " History can only establish the sudden change of mind ; in doing so it remains wholly within the sphere of the experience " (p. 91). In the light of modern research he does scant justice to the many details in Paul's conversion when he declares, " What [Paul's] eye beheld was merely a flash of light." And when he concludes his examination by saying, " Paul needed no special revelation to make him an Apostle. His vocation was determined when he resolved to be a Christian. Henceforward it was his duty to devote himself to the work in order to atone for his previous life as a persecutor " (p. 92), it must be felt that historical criticism fails to reveal the deepest springs of Paul's convictions and missionary activities.

Pfleiderer's account of Paul's conversion

is open to criticisms on the historical side. It is also inadequate on psychological grounds. While doing full justice to the intellectual element that stands behind both the conversion and the doctrine, he only mentions casually the moral element, that produced the great change in Paul's life, and the emotional factor he ignores. Recent writers have more than made good this defect. Wernle (*Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. i.) says summarily that the personal religion of Paul " is essentially one of moods and feelings." Weinel (*St. Paul*, pp. 62-76) makes a very complete analysis of the emotional elements that contribute to Paul's conversion. He emphasises the fact of Paul's patriotism. The offence of the Cross, he says, turned Paul into a persecutor. Moreover, he was a Pharisee, and under the training of the law he gained an extremely sensitive conscience and a deep earnestness which attended him throughout his career, but, he remarks, " Saul and the law could not remain at peace with one another." The hope of the Pharisees was that a glorious kingdom was to be the portion of a holy people.

Yet the people were never able really to fulfil the law. And so the people as a whole were lost. " A heart full of love must needs suffer keenly at the thought." Moreover, his moral sense was outraged by " the lie inherent in the law," viz. the presumption that it could be fulfilled. The law was then changed for him into a demoniacal tempta- tion to sin (Rom. vii. 7). Paul's vehement, proud, and fiery temperament that longed after good so passionately " rushed him headlong into manifold sins that separated him farther and farther from God. He felt himself lost and subject to the law of death." According to Weinel, such are the emotional states that preceded and led up to the conversion. Weinel pursues his analysis by asking, "What produced the change ? " Paul emphasises two experiences : he had seen the Lord ; he was called to be an Apostle. " Paul *saw* ; here is the crux for those who desire to substantiate the actual experience of which the Apostle was con- scious." Weinel concludes, that at his con- version Paul had a subjective vision of the risen Christ of the same nature as the one recorded in 2 Cor. xii., in consequence of

which his uneasy conscience is aroused, and the emotional crisis is complete when he becomes subjectively conscious of the indwelling Christ.

This analysis not only goes beyond all historical data, but it errs by excess of emotional treatment.   It also overlooks those intellectual processes by which Paul arrived at his conviction that Jesus was both the Messiah and Redeemer, and fails to explain how the doctrinal system of the Apostle could arise out of the emotional disturbance and subjective vision at his conversion.   The views, also, about the law, that are attributed to Paul, are overstrained, and in speaking of him as rushing headlong into manifold sins Weinel comes perilously near the position of Nietzsche, whose views Weinel justly deprecates in another part of his work.   Still, in spite of these drawbacks, it is as well that Weinel should have drawn attention to the feelings that preceded and accompanied Paul's conversion, because emotion must ever play an important part in cases of instantaneous and unexpected crises of thought and life that occupy such a large place in the history of religion.

3.   Psychology and Revelation

It cannot be said, however, that either the
treatment of Pfleiderer or Weinel is com-
pletely satisfactory.   Each gives but a one-
sided psychological view of Paul's state
prior to his conversion, Pfleiderer regarding
it as one of almost wholly intellectual con-
flict, and Weinel as one that was character-
istic of Paul's emotional temperament.

Paul's inward state was really one of
great complexity psychologically.   There is
every ground to suppose that his ideas, his
conscience, and his sensitive nature were all
alike stirred to their depths by what he
heard and saw in Jerusalem of the Christians,
and also that these psychical elements came
into conflict with one another.   It is agreed
that Paul was a thinker, a man of deeply
religious feeling, full of purpose and mystic
experience.   Such a nature could not but
be thrown into a state of commotion and
inward conflict by the testimonies of the
Christian martyrs, by the defence and death
of Stephen, and by all that had happened
to Jesus, especially after Paul's own bitter
experience   of   impotence   to   fulfil   the

righteousness of the law. In the interests of historical accuracy, some writers will allow of the existence of no previous mental disturbance, because none are recorded ; writers, too, who wish to preserve the supernatural aspect of the change wrought in Paul may deprecate the mention of any such conflict. But the probabilities of the whole case lead us to suppose that there actually was a period of internecine strife going on in Paul's heart and mind, and this for a time only intensified his zeal as a persecutor. The defect of Pfleiderer and Weinel is that they wish to find one element only that will account antecedently for the sudden change. Far more probable is it that the conversion followed on the interaction of all the elements of Paul's consciousness—intellectual, emotional, and moral. The whole man was moved. Impulses and inhibitions, reason and passion, old traditions and new truths, produced a state of such inner discord and doubt that at last he raged forth a persecutor. His only hope of relief seemed to lie in action. Fanaticism is often the expression of inward doubt. The persecutor's fury is blind be-

cause he shuts his eyes.   But Saul of Tarsus carried in the depths of his mind an idea and an image—the idea of the crucified Messiah, the image of the risen, exalted Christ.   Ideas and images may be suppressed, but they live and work in the sub-conscious realm of personality until some crisis or experience brings them into the light of full consciousness.

So much for the psychological antecedents of the conversion.   They are not to be regarded as its cause, but as the preliminary and favourable condition to the precipitation of a crisis.   The turning-point in his life and career came on the road to Damascus, when he " saw the Lord."   Paul's own words must form the ultimate basis for any understanding or explanation of the event. " Have I not seen Jesus our Lord ? " (1 Cor. ix. 1) ; " he appeared to me " (1 Cor. xv. 8).   These words state the fact of his experience in terms of sense-perception. " It was the good pleasure of God . . . to reveal His Son in me " (Gal. i. 15, 16) ; " God shined in our hearts to give the light of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ " (2 Cor. iv. 6).   These words state

the meaning of the fact for religious belief and teaching. The two pairs of sayings must not be confused. The first pair is a statement of fact, the second is a judgment of value. Each has its own significance, especially when reviewed in connection with the narratives in Acts and with subsequent developments within the early Church of spiritual experience.

Paul saw the risen, glorified Christ. According to the account in Acts, he also heard a voice. Let us take the question of sight, for it forms the storm-centre of criticism.

The conservative explanation is that Paul's experience was an " actual appearance of Jesus Christ to his senses. . . . Nothing but the fact itself . . . can fairly account for his certainty " (Findlay, Hastings' *Dict. Bible*, vol. iii. p. 703). Dr. Stevens (*The Theology of the New Testament*, p. 329), who does not commit himself to a personal opinion, says, however, that " the Acts and the Epistles agree in declaring that it was a supernatural revelation of Christ " to Paul, who " classes it along with the appearances of the risen Jesus to His disciples on earth (1 Cor. xv. 5-8) as an objective fact." This writer concludes

that " no explanation tallies with all the facts known to us except that which Paul himself gives." This belief in the super-natural manifestation of Christ's presence to the senses of Paul as an objective fact in time and space is attended with such obvious difficulties that it can hardly be a matter of surprise that other explanations have been offered.

The rationalistic explanation of Baur * goes to the opposite extreme. The so-called appearance of the risen Jesus was only a manifestation of Christ to the soul of Paul. Pfleiderer speaks too of Paul's conversion as " the decision arrived at within his mind," or " the decisive turn of his convictions," although he admits that there was a " sensuous experience." But this was wholly subjective and " agrees with what happened on previous occasions." This view is also unsatisfactory. It is an inadequate explanation not only of the details given in Acts, but of Paul's personal testimony in the matter. Moreover, it seems an unnecessarily emasculated account of the conversion in view of the mass of evidence

* *Paul,* E.T. i. 76.

presented by writers like James and Starbuck of the experiences that frequently attend the spiritual crisis called " conversion."

The naturalistic hypothesis of ecstatic vision, put forward by Holsten as the decisive factor in the conversion, is followed by Weinel, who says,* " Paul saw."   In explaining this statement Weinel says we must distinguish between " normal vision " and " visionary sight."   The retina of the eye receives impressions of objects from without in normal vision, or is impressed with images by emotional disturbance within the brain—this latter he calls visionary sight, and supposes that Paul's " seeing " was of this kind.   He illustrates it by the visions of Joan of Arc, and says we ought boldly to adopt this opinion concerning Paul's experience.

The theory of vision does more justice to the Biblical account of the occurrence than the rationalistic explanation of Baur and Pfleiderer.   It is also in accord with the facts brought to light by the researches of modern psychologists.   It also connects the

* *St. Paul,* p. 84.

experience of Paul with accounts of visions
of decisive religious import in the Apostle's
own life and in the history of the whole
Bible.   But the vision-theory as presented
by these writers makes the experience
wholly subjective.   Whatever good result
it may have produced, it was only a vision.
That which changed Paul from a persecutor
to a believer, and from a Jewish Pharisee to
a Christian Apostle, came from himself.
The explanation is frankly naturalistic.   No
attempt is made to explain the vision or
the emotions and ideas that gave rise to it
by any influence or power outside the
Apostle.   As such the theory, however
reasonable, fails to do justice not only to
Paul's personal convictions as to the ob-
jective reality of the appearance of Christ,
but to the whole of the N.T. teaching, which
insists that man is open to impressions and
impulses that come to him from a spiritual
and divine environment.

The N.T. view of human personality and
its relation to God leaves room for another
explanation.   The vision theory makes the
appearance of the glorified Christ a merely
subjective experience on the part of Paul;

he *saw*, although there was no object to be seen. But the N.T., as a whole, regards the spiritual world as objective. Man is the subject of divine visitation and influence. In seeking to interpret the experience of Paul we must get the N.T. standpoint. So we are bound to say that if it was a " vision," it was also a Christophany. There was an objective reality that gave rise to Paul's impression. We cannot suppose that the N.T. intends us to believe that our Lord only this once, since his Ascension, returned to the earth in bodily form. But there is nothing unreasonable in supposing that Christ so manifested the reality of his continued existence and heavenly glory that Paul literally *saw*.

One hesitates to employ the uncertain hypothesis of telepathy to account for the appearance to Paul, but it does suggest that the Spirit of Christ in some way manifested his presence and heavenly glory to the persecutor. The human personality is now known to be in possession of such mysterious, sub-conscious powers of communication with other living personalities that to a believer in the continued existence

of Christ after the death on the Cross there
is no difficulty in believing the possibility
of the perception of his presence among
his followers.   If he " appeared," it was
because he still lived.   The retina of Paul's
eye was impressed not by an emotional
disturbance within his brain, but by an
apparitional manifestation under forms of
space and time of a reality without.   There
was a revelation of Christ to Paul.

The experience of Paul on the Damascus
road harmonises with the N.T. teaching as
to the powers of the human personality to
receive impressions from a world as real
as the physical universe, the human spirit
being the organ of communion with the
divine.   The main point to remember is
that the N.T. regards man as open to God
on the spiritual side of his nature.   The
psychological explanation is not in itself
adequate.   The operation of so-called super-
natural influences must be recognised if the
Biblical standpoint is to be rightly appre-
ciated.   This latter does not exclude a
psychological account of the strictly human
conditions under which the conversion took
place.   It supplements it and does more

justice to all the facts of the experience. Our sense-perceptions are but the reactions of human consciousness amid the realities of its physical environment. The appearance may be different from the reality, but it is our interpretation of that reality. The manifestation of Christ to Paul need not have been in the actual human body of the Saviour as he walked the earth, but it was an " appearance " that satisfied Paul that Jesus had not been an impostor, who was rightly put to death, nor even that he was the crucified Messiah of the Judaic Christians, but he was the risen, living Saviour of all men.

Paul had seen his glory, and believed. During his retirement in Arabia the far-reaching doctrinal implications of this truth gradually took shape in Paul's mind, under the inspiration and guidance of the Holy Spirit, and he thenceforward became the " Apostle of the Gentiles," making divine grace and human faith the watchwords of all his teaching.

CHAPTER VIII

THERE are two general types of conversion
—the one is sudden, the other gradual.
The conversion of Paul is the classic N.T.
example of the first type. As already seen,
a spiritual experience such as his almost
baffles the attempts of psychology to analyse
or even understand the factors that co-
operated in bringing it about. But the
N.T. clearly indicates the psychological
conditions under which conversion may
normally be expected to happen, even if
the process be less startling than in the case
of Saul of Tarsus. A study of more gradual
conversion enables us to see the successive
steps by which the great change takes
place, and thus to understand the conditions
which precede and accompany all con-

version.   The popular mind will always be
most impressed with the Pauline type, but
the probability is that most conversions
will be less dramatic than the great event
on the Damascus road and others of like
kind.

" Modern   psychology,"   says   Professor
Percy Gardner, " is fully disposed to allow
that sudden conversion is in accord with
experience ;   though amid the conventions
and refinements of modern civilised life a
more gradual change of life is more usual." *
Sudden conversions are, then, a crisis almost
wholly   inexplicable ;   gradual   conversions
are more in the nature of a transition from
a lower state of life to a higher.   The former
appear to be spontaneous, the latter are
deliberative.   The Pauline or sudden con-
version makes the impression of being of
supernatural origin, the normal or gradual
conversion seems to result almost entirely
from   human   volition.   In   the   one   case,
" conversion " seems hardly the right term
to describe what is more of the nature of a
divine regeneration, or new birth ; in the
other   case   the   man   himself   " converts,"

* *The Religious Experience of St. Paul,* p. 33.

or changes from evil to good, and the result is a spiritual reformation. Sudden conversions are most frequently marked by excessive emotional accompaniments and sometimes by strange psychic experiences, such as visions, voices, and automatism. Gradual conversions, on the other hand, take place with calmer feelings of sorrow, trust, and joy, and are usually devoid of anything " uncanny " or mystical. The first are sudden as a flash of lightning, the second are like the dawning of a new day.

But it must not be imagined that there are two *kinds* of conversion, although we may distinguish two different *types*. In both sudden and gradual conversions the same laws operate, only in one case the preliminary factors are hidden from view and work sub-consciously and often rapidly, while in the other they are open to observation. It is from a study of the conditions which the N.T. lays down as necessary to normal conversion that we get to understand all such experiences. These conditions will be seen to be not the arbitrary or irrational requirements of a doctrinal system ; they are psychologically necessary if the spiritual

and moral change involved in conversion is to take place in the human personality. Here the truth is to be arrived at by no mere " proof-text " method, but by a broad survey of N.T. teaching looked at in the light of experience and generally accepted psychological teaching.

It will be shown in what follows that conversion, according to the N.T., takes place under the influence of two general ideas or convictions which lead to two specific states or processes of consciousness out of the interaction of which the crisis arises. The two general ideas or convictions relate to human sin on the one hand and to divine grace on the other. In the two resultant states they are individualised as repentance and faith respectively.

1.   The Sense of Sin

The N.T. teaches that human personality only comes to spiritual perfection in a recoil from sin. The consciousness of sin is one of the two main factors that help to precipitate the moral crisis through which a man must pass if he is to attain to the salvation and consummation of his person-

ality. This " sense of sin," as it is popularly called, may have a varied content, including feelings of uneasiness, impulses to escape from evil, and ideas of a deity disobeyed or a duty unfulfilled. It shows many degrees of intensity, from almost sub-conscious stirrings of the moral nature up to the acutest feeling of guilt and of self-accusation. It almost invariably includes a consciousness of self-separation from God, whose holy law has been wilfully violated.

The N.T. literature is pervaded with this consciousness of human wrong-doing. Not only does it contain a doctrine of Sin, but actual sinfulness is presupposed as a universal fact of history and as an invariable state in every individual. " The Christian revelation," says Dr. W. N. Clarke, " uniformly addresses man as a sinful being." * The N.T. is unique amongst the writings of the ancient world in its witness to this consciousness of sin. That is not to say that the religious literature of pre-Christian times is altogether lacking in this respect. In Babylon, for instance, writings have been discovered and called the " Penitential

* *Outlines of Christian Theology,* p. 227.

13

Psalms," which are by no means destitute
of expressions of a deep consciousness of
sin. Many of the Greek writers, too, in
later times show that they were made keenly
aware of the existence of moral evil. But
both Babylonians and Greeks were poly-
theists, in spite of certain notable approaches
to monotheism, and consequently the con-
sciousness of the existence and awfulness
of moral evil could not take that definite
form of a " sense of sin " which only arises
when God is believed to be one and personal
and when moral evil is regarded as rebellion
against His holy will. It was among the
Hebrews that the sense of sin proper arose,
and in the O.T. we see it developing as a
result of the " ethical monotheism " of
the prophets. It was the revelation of the
sovereign will of God contained in the O.T.
that brought home to the Jews the con-
sciousness of sin. As Paul says, " I had
not known sin, except through the law "
(Rom. vii. 7). But the pages of the N.T.
reflect an advance upon the O.T. view, which
had already outdistanced the profoundest
utterances of Babylonian or Hellenic thinkers.

How did this extreme sensitiveness to

moral evil in human nature arise in primitive Christianity? What were the causes of its appearance? The first cause to be mentioned is the higher revelation of the nature of God. Jesus, as we have seen, put in the foreground of his teaching the Fatherhood of God, and he amplified in parable and precept not only the sovereign will of that divine and universal Father, but also His love and pity for man. Sin, then, not only becomes alienation from or rebellion against a supreme Law-giver, but also the self-separation of a son from a Father's love. It is the rupture of a personal relationship through man's self-will.

A second cause of the deepened sense of sin was the interpretation which Christ gave to the moral law. He made it more exacting by making its demands penetrate to the inner springs of conduct. In his hands it tested the motives of actions in human life. The law had forbidden murder; he made it prohibitive of hate. By the law adultery was condemned; by his application of the law the lustful thought which prompted the deed was shown to be sinful. His ethical claim, if met by his

disciples, would make their moral conduct exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees. The law had first aroused the consciousness of sin; his interpretation deepened the feeling of self-condemnation and quickened a new sense of broken obligation to God.

A third consideration is the sinless personality of Jesus. His human life became a touchstone of character. He unfolded the good which man ought to pursue not in terms of legal enactment, nor as mere maxims in a system of speculative ethics, but in the realm of his own actual life. In his presence the disciple felt like Peter when he cried out, " Depart from me ; for I am a sinful man, O Lord." The moral manhood of Jesus was perfect. Compared with him, the holiest of men could not but be defective, and themselves become conscious of the depths to which sinful man had fallen.

Sin generally in the O.T. consists in breaking God's law. In the N.T. sin is viewed not as the sum of so many isolated acts of transgression, but rather as the outcome of an evil inward state, " Sin is law-

lessness " (1 John iii. 4 ; *cf.* Matt. xii. 35).
This inward state of sin is traced to a prior
separation of the will from God and a
voluntary surrender of it to evil.   In the
Synoptic teaching of Jesus the source of
evil is in the heart—" for from within, out
of the heart of man, evil thoughts proceed "
(Mark vii. 21-3).   And we have seen that
by the " heart " is meant the centre of
the personal life of thinking and willing.
In James and Peter the will is surrendered
to evil through desire.   According to Paul,
it is the " flesh " that moves the will.
" When we were in the flesh," he says, " the
sinful passions wrought in our members "
(Rom. vii. 5).   The " flesh," as we have
seen, includes more than sensual appetites.
It is a disposition that manifests itself in
such states as enmity, jealousy, and envy
(Gal. v. 20).   The fleshly mind, according
to Dorner,* " is the God-resisting disposition
in virtue of which man in self-sufficiency
and pride opposes himself to God."   Paul's
presentation of the Gospel under the aspect
of reconciliation presupposes estrangement.
The Epistle to the Hebrews with its doctrine

* *System of Christian Doctrine*, vol. iii. p. 56.

of the Priesthood of Christ shows how provision is made for the approach of man to God, from whom sin had previously separated him.

The consciousness of sin as self-separation from God carries with it the sense of guilt or of personal responsibility for wrongdoing. This sense of guilt manifested itself under the first preaching of the Apostles at Pentecost. The multitudes "were pricked in their hearts" (Acts ii. 37). The references to the wrath of God (Rom. i. 18, ii. 5; 2 Thess. i. 8, etc.) express the sense of divine disapproval and the liability to punishment to which sin exposes men. Paul says, "We all once lived in the lusts of the flesh, doing the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were by nature *children of wrath*" (Eph. ii. 3). Death, as a final separation from God, was felt to be the due penalty of sin (Rom. v. 12, vi. 23), which through Adam's fall had become a universal experience of mankind.

The consciousness of sin might be regarded as merely a subjective morbid symptom in the early Christians, were it not that the N.T. shows that it sprang out of actual

experience of sin. Sin was both an observed fact of human history and an experienced fact in the personal life. James, while unsparing in his moral judgments on the selfishness, pride, and contentions that existed even among the Christians, says, " In many things we all stumble " (Jas. iii. 2). Peter besought believers " to abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul " (1 Pet. ii. 11). Even among the " spiritual " at Corinth Paul learns of the existence of " jealousy and strife " (1 Cor. iii. 3), and of gross immorality (1 Cor. v. 1). John extends its range to include " the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the vainglory of life " (1 John ii. 16). To deny the existence of sin is to be guilty of self-deception (1 John i. 8). The practical and oft-repeated exhortation to holiness of life, with which the Epistles of the N.T. abound, show that on the part of the writers there was a recognition of the depravity of sin into which even the redeemed were in constant danger of relapsing. This acute consciousness of sin is accompanied, however, by the presupposition that in man the faculty of willing still remains and the

light of conscience is not extinguished
(Rom. ii. 14, 15). The essential volitional
core of personality is indestructible, and
gives to man the capacity to respond to
divine grace.

2. THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF GRACE

Concurrently with the development of
the sense of human sin in the N.T. there
emerges a consciousness of divine grace. The
N.T. nowhere teaches that man can save
himself from sin. That man, although
enslaved by evil, has still the faculty of
willing, renders his salvation possible. But
the operation of a determining divine factor
is everywhere recognised as being indis-
pensable. This factor is God's grace re-
vealed in the gift of Christ. The conscious-
ness of divine and saving grace dawned in
the minds of the men who first looked upon
Jesus and listened to his teaching, but it
came to the clear light of day in the spiritual
experience and teaching of Paul. Although
in some of the N.T. writings the grace of
God is not specifically mentioned, yet it is
uniformly presupposed in all. The whole
texture of the N.T. is shot through and

through with the golden thread of God's
redeeming love in Christ Jesus, for it is
almost exclusively as *redemptive* grace that
the spontaneous unmerited favour of God
is thought of by the early canonical writers.

The Synoptic Gospels reflect the deep
impression made by the love which
Jesus showed towards the worst of sinners.
Men wondered at the " words of grace "
which he uttered in their hearing. Never
man so spake. He who himself was sinless
showed more patience towards the wrong-
doer than the religious men of the time.
He saw more hope for the self-condemned
sinner who smote the breast saying, " God
be merciful to me, a sinner," than for the
self-righteous Pharisee who recounted with
honest pride his many deeds of religious
devotion. The one was " justified " rather
than the other. If Jesus made men feel
their sin, he made them feel at the same
time that God was imparting to them salva-
tion from sin in the person and work of
His Messiah. And so Jesus appeared as no
mere reformer, he was a redeemer. The
great Physician's diagnosis of sin was ruth-
less, because his remedy was radical. He

made men see themselves as they really are in dark contrast with what they ought to be, because that in his own person and work was revealed the secret of what men might be and yet should be when all God's loving purposes were fulfilled in the realm of human nature. With the death of Jesus and the Baptism of the Spirit, the early believers gained a new insight into the redemptive aspects of God's grace. During his earthly life Jesus had made men feel the goodwill of the Divine Father in his own deeds of mercy. But the cross shed a new light on the meaning of that life of love, for it made the disciples understand the saying of their Master that the Son of Man came both " to minister and to give his life a ransom for many."

Calvary was followed by Pentecost. The gift of the Spirit was another crowning proof to the early disciples of the unlimited, though undeserved, love of God to sinful man. " The love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Spirit which was given unto us " (Rom. v. 5). The giving was mediated through the crucified and risen Christ. " This Jesus," says

Peter, " did God raise up, whereof we all
are witnesses. Being therefore by the right
of God exalted, and having received of the
Father the promise of the Holy Spirit,
he hath poured forth this, which ye see
and hear " (Acts ii. 33). As in the personal
history of Jesus a spiritual experience—
the Baptism of the Spirit—marked the
beginning of his beneficent ministry of
teaching, healing, and proclaiming the
Kingdom of God, so to the men that con-
stituted the nucleus of the Church there
happened a collective experience—again a
Baptism of the Spirit—which began and
alone explains the processes and powers
most characteristic of that early Christian
community. The recipients of the spiritual
gifts, which were in such extraordinary
abundance and variety, were able to witness
for Christ, to heal the sick, to do signs and
wonders, to speak the word of God with
boldness, to go forth on a widespread mis-
sionary propaganda of the gospel of the
grace of God.

The three events of the Crucifixion, the
Resurrection, and Pentecost were closely
related in time and in meaning. They

formed the triple summits of the great
dividing range between the old life and the
new. Psychologically, the experience of
Pentecost could be described first of all as
an enlargement of the self-consciousness of
the disciples. Something analogous to the
enhancing of the self-consciousness of our
Lord at his Baptism now took place in the
consciousness of his followers. They be-
came aware of a new and intimate relation
to God. The disciples gained a new insight
into the significance that the Passion and
Resurrection of Christ had in this experience.
They recognised the expression of the love
of God coming to them alike in the suffer-
ings, the power, and the spiritual gifts of
His Messiah.

Secondly, another marked feature of this
spiritual experience was the coming into
possession of unexpected powers. Their
natural capacity of being and doing good
was re-enforced. The gift of the Spirit
supplied them with the dynamic of the new
life in Christ—they received moral *power*.
The outwardly and apparently objective
phenomena of the sound of rushing wind,
the appearance of fiery tongues, and the

gifts of speech, were but outward signs of their supernatural endowment. The disciples, like their Lord at his Baptism, acquired a new self-determination. Their wills became the *media* for the expression of the will of God. Henceforth they were to become executive officers upon earth to carry out God's saving purposes for the salvation of men. This was the secret of their willingness to witness and to endure hardship, to suffer and even die, that the Gospel might reach to the uttermost parts of the earth.

Thirdly, the Pentecost experience gave them a new insight into the social significance of human personality as God intended it to be in Christianity. The Christian was not to be an isolated, exclusive individual; he was to be a *person* in the fullest sense of the term. Won from among men of all classes and nations, he was yet to be gathered into a spiritual community—the Church—wherein personality, through fellowship with other personalities, would alone be completely developed. It has been said that it was Jesus who discovered the individual; but it may further be said that he turned

the individual into a person—and that by giving him a place in a kingdom of kindred spirits. Pentecost saw the realisation of this truth, and in the first application of it the earliest converts had fellowship not only in such things as doctrine, prayer, and sacrament, but even in goods and possessions. The gift of the Spirit, which enlightened and energised the disciples, had depended in the first instance upon their being with one accord in one place, and the continuance of that gift was to be contingent upon this unity of mind and will. Their Master had said, " Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst." The disciples now learned the meaning of this truth. As we should say, they now knew that the human personality only reaches its highest development in a social environment wherein the spirit of Christ unites men in mutual fellowship with one another and in fellowship with God.

The psychological effects of Pentecost, as a revelation of the divine grace, may be summarised as follows : To the *mind* of men there came a gift of insight into the truth

of man's relationship to God as mediated by Christ which resulted in a new self-consciousness of spiritual kinship with God. To the *will* there was given an extraordinary bestowal of spiritual power which made men capable of an obedience to God and a service for the sake of humanity and which amounted to a new self-determination.   To the *emotions* God gave a depth and warmth of love that made men other-regarding rather than self-regarding, social rather than selfish, knitting them together as sharers in one corporate life and as members of one divine organism.

The full meaning of God's free gift of Christ as the Saviour from sin and His bestowal of the Holy Spirit upon all believers was first recognised by Paul as the result of his own personal experience both as a convert and as a missionary.   In the universal application of the truth he became the Apostle of the Gentiles.   Thus he saved Christianity from the danger of becoming a Jewish sect, and made it world-wide and all-embracing.   The explicit N.T. teaching about grace undoubtedly owes more to Paul than to any other writer.   The conscious-

ness of the divine grace appears in the salutations of nearly all the Apostle's Epistles.
Grace is felt to be the objective ground of
all the blessing of the Christian life. It is
the grace of God or of our Lord Jesus Christ.
It outweighs the power of sin in human
life (Rom. v. 20) ; it is the ground of
evangelical justification (Rom. iii. 24) and
the ultimate cause of our salvation (Eph.
ii. 5, 8). The passages which describe the
place of grace in man's redemption are too
numerous to mention. Lechler,* in his
Apostolic Times, says that the kernel, the
life-centre, of Paul's Christian feeling and
doctrine is " God's grace in Christ towards
the guilt-laden sinner." Paul's doctrine
sprang out of his personal experience of
the guilt and of the power of sin. But he
could say at last, " By God's grace I am
what I am," for he knew that " where sin
abounded, grace did much more abound."
The subject is not restricted to Paul. The
consciousness of God's grace was central in
the experience of the N.T. times. Side by
side with the consciousness of sin there is

* Quoted in article " Sin," Hastings' *Dict. of Bible,*
vol. iv.

this consciousness of something " given " to actually save man from evil, supernatural in origin, coming from God, and manifested in the person and saving work of Christ. This consciousness of grace is a fundamental conviction underlying or explaining the experience, whether sudden or gradual, which we call conversion. " A man who is converted in the New Testament sense," says Prof. Wheeler Robinson,* " is one who has surrendered to forces immeasurably greater than anything he has of himself ; one who has awakened to the over-whelming consciousness of a spiritual world brought to a focus before him in the Person of Christ ; one who finds the little bay of his individual life, with all its little pebbles and little shells and little weeds, flooded by the tide of a great deep, over which the very Spirit of God broods."

* *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, p. 322.

14

CHAPTER IX

THE sense of sin and the consciousness of
grace are the psychological background in
the N.T. out of which there emerges the
definite personal state of deliverance from
sin. They both form the two elements in
the spiritual atmosphere in which a Christian
draws breath for the first time, and which
make possible the individual experiences
respectively of repentance and faith which
are the indispensable conditions of salvation.
Repentance and Faith are the two Scriptural
names for the two specific psychological
states or processes through which the human
personality passes in conversion. The con-
sciousness of sin leads the individual to
repentance. The consciousness of divine
grace inspires the man with faith. Both
must be regarded as preliminary to regener-

ation proper. Dr. W. N. Clarke (*Outlines of Christian Theology*, p. 401) says, " Repentance and faith are the human acts in which the divine life is begun." They unite in conversion. The term " conversion " is sometimes employed comprehensively to cover the whole process of the soul's renewal, as in James' Gifford Lectures (*Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 189). Some theological writers, on the other hand, make it one of the results of regeneration, as in Laidlaw's chapter on " Psychology of the New Life " (*Bible Doctrine of Man*, pp. 263-66). But it is best to view it as strictly preliminary to the new life in Christ.

The N.T. teaches that man's dual consciousness of sin and of grace passes ultimately into a new consciousness of inward change when the human personality is transformed by the introduction of the new principle of life in Christ Jesus and the infusion of new powers of moral energy by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. This inward, radical, and divinely wrought change is called "regeneration." But throughout the N.T. the co-operation of the divine and the human is fully recognised, and " conversion "

is the name given to the intermediate steps
taken by man in order that regeneration
may become an accomplished fact within
his spiritual development. If "regeneration"
be the term used for the complete trans-
forming work of God in the soul, "conversion"
is best regarded as antecedent to the change.
To treat " conversion " as the result of the
divine act of " regeneration " makes the
factors that enter into human consciousness
secondary to the change. But our purpose
here is to trace the conscious stages by
which human personality is represented in
the N.T. as emerging into the state of saving
relationship to the Divine Personality. And,
moreover, to place conversion first is more
in harmony with the N.T. teaching as a
whole, which regards the will as the essen-
tial element in man. Sin is an act of will,
and the entrance into the state of salvation
must be volitional if the freedom and re-
sponsibility of man are to preserved.

1. REPENTANCE

The place of repentance in conversion is
made prominent in the N.T. The Gospels
record that Jesus, like John the Baptist,

had begun his ministry by calling men to repentance (Mark i. 4, 15 ; Matt. iii. 2, iv. 17). The Sermon on the Mount opens with the Beatitudes, which announce the blessedness of the poor in spirit, of mourners, of the meek, and of those that hunger and thirst after righteousness. The state of mind which includes sorrow for sin, the sense of spiritual need, the desire for positive goodness, is a necessary qualification for entrance into the Kingdom of God. In the parabolic teaching of Jesus the self-condemned publican who cries " God be merciful to me, a sinner," is nearer to " justification," in the sense of both pardon and moral rectification, than the self-satisfied Pharisee, because the feeling of sinfulness pulls down all barriers to the inflow of God's forgiving love and recreating power. It was only when the prodigal " began to be in want " and " came to himself " that he returned to his father with the confession, " I have sinned."

Jesus commanded the disciples to renounce and put to death the lower self in order that the higher self might come to life. But the soul's resurrection involves the

prior anguish of its crucifixion. Hence
Christ's insistence upon the universal neces-
sity of repentance. Only by aversion from
the state of sinfulness and personal sorrow
for sinful acts can there be initiated that
moral and spiritual experience of conversion.
The close connection of repentance and
conversion is seen in the earliest Apostolic
preaching, " Repent ye, therefore, and be
converted (R.V. turn again), that your sins
may be blotted out " (Acts iii. 19). In this
passage the volitional element of repentance
is emphasised. It is an act rather than a
state. The penitent is summoned to face
the fact of his sin, that in his revulsion from
it he may turn for deliverance to God. But
in other passages repentance is regarded as
a subjective state induced by the operation
of divine grace. " To the Gentiles also
hath God granted repentance unto life "
(Acts xi. 18, *cf.* iii. 26), " The goodness of God
leadeth thee to repentance " (Rom. ii. 4).
The conviction of sin which brings about
true repentance is the work of the Holy
Spirit (John xvi. 8).

When regarded as a subjective state, the
emotional element predominates. A psy-

chological analysis of this emotion as de-
picted in the N.T. will enable us to see what
an important part it plays in the transition
to the new life. Dr. G. F. Stout (*The
Groundwork of Psychology*, pp. 188-92)
draws attention to three points in the general
nature of the emotions. " The first general
characteristic," he says, " is that however
composite they may be, they each contain,
as *unifying centre of the complex, a unique
and irreducible element*." Secondly, " it must
never be forgotten that emotions are sub-
jective attitudes towards an *object*." And
thirdly, " the typical emotions are each
*connected with certain characteristic directions
or conation-trends of activity*." In applying
this analysis to the emotion of N.T. repent-
ance, we first of all have little difficulty in
finding that the quality of sorrow is the
" unifying centre of the complex " of feelings
which constitute it an emotional state.
Contrition is the unique and irreducible
element in this spiritual experience.

Secondly, we are not left in doubt as to
the object or objects towards which the
emotion of repentance is a subjective atti-
tude. As an essentially religious emotion

it involves a subjective relation to an objective and divine reality. In one word, it is " repentance *toward* God " (Acts xx. 21), or " Godly sorrow " (2 Cor. vii. 10). Without due recognition of the wrong done to God, whose law has been broken or whose loving purpose has been frustrated by sin, the emotion may become a mere vague *regret* without any regenerative force. On the other hand, it may sink into despairing *remorse* which is exclusively subjective, and often destructive of true selfhood. " Godly sorrow," says Paul, " worketh repentance unto salvation, a repentance which bringeth no regret ; but the sorrow of the world worketh death " (2 Cor. vii. 10).

Thirdly, as all typical emotions are connected with " directions or conation-trends of activity," repentance is regarded by the N.T. as setting the will in action. It is the stirring of the inner self to purposive movement. This accounts for its close association with conversion in the preaching of the Apostles. The emotion of repentance is at bottom a feeling of sorrow for wrongdoing. When this latter is recognised as wrong done to God, the Holy Spirit brings " conviction

of sin." A state of incipient movement at once arises, and the soul wills to forsake sin and to turn to God for salvation. To both his Jewish and Gentile hearers Paul declared " that they should *repent* and *turn* to God, *doing* works worthy of repentance " (Acts xxvi. 20).

The practical insistence on appropriate " fruits " of repentance by John the Baptist (Matt. iii. 8), and in the early Church generally (Rev. ii. 5), was due to a profound psychological instinct which saw that repentance was not to be a mere subjective emotion, but it is a means to an end and must issue in volitional activity and overt Christian conduct. It may begin as a *state*, induced by the good Spirit of God, but it must become an *act* which gives outward proof of the inward change of heart. This accounts for Christ's declaration of salvation as having come to Zacchæus when the tax-gatherer said, " Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor ; and if I have wrongfully exacted aught of any man, I restore fourfold " (Luke xix. 8). Here was not the mere expression of good intention, but the actual giving " on the spot," as we would say.

There is no suggestion in the N.T. that
works have any " merit," or are a means to
salvation; the whole emphasis is laid, in this
connection, upon their evidential value of the
vitality of penitential sorrow and the reality
of the conversion to which that sorrow has
led a man.   Repentance is only one of the
conditions laid down in the N.T. for true
conversion.   The second, and in some re-
spects the more important, is Faith.

2.   FAITH

Among the first " principles of Christ "
the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews
mentions the " foundation of repentance
and of faith towards God " (Heb. vi. 1).
If repentance is fundamental, Scripturally
and psychologically, to the right beginning
of the Christian life, so also is " faith."
In conversion both are involved.   " They
cannot be separated," says Dr. W. B. Pope
(*Compendium of Christian Theology*, vol. ii.
p. 371), " as repentance implies pre-existing
faith, and faith implies pre-existing re-
pentance. . . . Though both are introductory
to the state of grace, properly so-called,
faith in its saving exercise is the transition

point where the state of conviction passes into life in Christ." Faith is not only the " transition point " in conversion, it is also the underlying ground of all subsequent spiritual life, and therefore occupies a dominant position in the N.T. teaching. The part played by faith, or what is usually spoken of as " saving faith," in conversion is of supreme interest to the psychological inquirer, for it is now recognised as not a mere doctrinal requirement in a " plan of salvation," or an irrational act of blind credulity, but a mental state that is indispensable if the human personality is to pass from low levels of existence to the highest spiritual experiences of the moral and religious life.

Regarded psychologically, faith is a state of consciousness which is capable of being analysed and understood like any other psychical state. That it springs out of a prior and more general consciousness of grace and has its ultimate origin in the work of God's Spirit within the soul does not prevent us from studying the elements that constitute it, and the conditions under which it may arise and become operative in conversion.

Most psychologists are agreed that in every conscious state three mental elements interact. They are separable in thought, but no one element can exist without the presence of the other two. But in each moment of consciousness one is more promi- nent than the other two, and gives its dis- tinctive name to the total state. These three elements, as we have already seen, are Thinking, or cognition (the intellectual element), Feeling (the emotional element), and Willing (the purposeful or moral ele- ment). The faith-state as reflected in the writings of the N.T. can be readily analysed into these three elements. Sometimes the intellectual factor (as belief) operates most prominently, at other times the emotional (as a feeling of trust) bears sway, and yet again the moral side (as purposeful surren- der) at times appears in the forefront. Faith is a complex state of mind in which all these elements are present within the per- sonality. But one or other, according to the temperament and disposition of the subject, takes the lead and gives character to the whole state.

Much misconception about the nature of

faith has arisen to perplex souls through the failure to recognise the many-sided nature of this critical and decisive experience that precedes or rather conditions entrance into the Kingdom of God. A review of some of the more important passages of the N.T. that deal with the subject will show that believing (as an exercise of thought), trusting (as a mode of feeling), and surrendering (as an act of volition) are all truly Scriptural aspects of the state of faith, and all necessary therefore in some degree to conversion.*

1. *The amount of belief* that enters into the N.T. conception of faith is easily exaggerated by the fact that there is no English verb to express the exercise of faith. Of necessity recourse is had to the word " believe " as a transition of $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$, which seems to imply that faith is wholly intellectual assent to certain truths. Whereas the emphasis in the N.T. falls on other psychological elements in faith. Still, belief is not absent from soteriological faith. Jesus called upon men to repent " and

* I am indebted to the suggestive work of Dr. W. R. Inge on *Faith and its Psychology* for much in this section.

believe in the Gospel '' (Mark i. 15).   At
Antioch, we read, " a great number that
believed turned unto the Lord '' (Acts xi. 21).
Here the prominence of believing-faith in
conversion is noticeable.   In the eleventh
chapter of Hebrews, where the triumphant
faith of O.T. heroes is clearly unshaken
reliance upon God, and where we read that
without faith it is impossible to be well-
pleasing to God, it is yet stated clearly that
" he that cometh to God *must believe that **He
is**,* and that **He** is a rewarder of them that
seek after Him '' (Heb. xi. 6).   But the in-
sufficiency of mere intellectual belief alone
is seen in the words, " Thou believest that
God is one ;   thou doest well :   the devils
also believe, and shudder '' (Jas. ii. 19).
However important beliefs about God or
about Jesus Christ may be to intelligent
conversion and to the stability of the sub-
sequent Christian life, it is not to be sup-
posed that the N.T. lays the chief emphasis
on this aspect of the faith-state.   The in-
tellect itself has little or no power to move
men to forsake sin, although it may afford
good reasons for such action.

2. The quality of *trustful feeling* in saving

faith predominates in the N.T. teaching on
the subject. This is in accord with the
history of religious experience in all ages.
Belief affords rational grounds for trust and
justifies action springing therefrom. But
the mental quality that induces and charac-
terises conversional faith is primarily con-
fidence in and reliance upon some one. The
insistence of the N.T. on this feeling of trust
as the root of true faith is clear enough in
the original Greek, but is obscured in the
English version through the lack of a simple
verb to express in one word the phrase—
" to-have-faith-in." The translators of the
N.T. have had to fall back upon the word
" believe," which quite obscures the original
meaning of the writers, and seems to lay the
chief stress on the intellectual element in
faith. But in numberless places where the
phrases " believe-*in* " or " believe-*on* " occur,
it is not belief that is emphasised but, in
reality, confidence or the feeling of trust.
A reference to such passages will show that
the object of this faith is a person, " God "
or " Christ," so that the phrases " to-believe-
in," or " to-believe-on," or " faith-toward "
connotes trustful reliance upon the personal

object mentioned. This appears in such representative passages as, " Believe-on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved " (Acts xvi. 31) ; " Ye believe-in God, believe also in me " (John xiv. 1) ; " To him that worketh not, but believeth-on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness " (Rom. iv. 5). It is because of this quality of trustful feeling in faith as essential to conversion that the testimony of others plays such an important part in leading a penitent into saving reliance upon Christ as Saviour. A convert may have a very imperfect doctrinal system of belief, his views about the nature of God or the Atonement may be hazy, but if he can be induced to trust himself to the divine goodwill he may have the experience of deliverance before he understands the rationale of it. The teaching of Christianity in this respect is profoundly in accord with the processes of life on other levels. A child trusts-in its parent's love and acts upon that feeling long before it understands. Subsequent understanding may deepen the trust, but the instinctive feeling of the child precedes the reasoned reflection of later

years.   Christ expressed this child-like factor
in saving faith in conversion when he said,
" Except ye turn and become as little chil-
dren, ye shall in no wise enter into the
Kingdom of Heaven " (Matt. xviii. 3).

3. *The moral element of self-surrender* is
also important.   " By faith Abraham, when
he was called, *obeyed* " (Heb. xi. 8).   Paul's
gospel is made known " *unto obedience* of
faith " (Rom. xvi. 26).   Christ made a
direct summons to the will when he simply
said, " Follow me."   And sometimes saving
faith is an immediate response to the
authority of that Divine Master.   In very
many places in the N.T. faith in the per-
sonality and work of Jesus Christ is made
pre-eminent because he is regarded as the
manifestation of God, the point being that
faith in " God " or in " Christ" is faith in
a person, it is " an absolute transference of
trust from ourselves to another," and a
moral choice and decision arising out of such
a feeling.   Faith is thus seen to be an act of
the whole man.   " With the heart man be-
lieveth unto righteousness " (Rom. x. 10).
The whole personality, viewed as focussed
in the heart, believes intellectually, feels

15

trustingly, and yields willingly to God in Christ.

Dr. Inge, who in his book *The Psychology of Faith* reviews the whole range of the subject, says, " At the end of the first century we find Faith established as a characteristic Christian virtue or temper, with a full and rich meaning. The Christians called themselves ' believers ' and spoke of ' the Faith ' without further specification or of what they believed or trusted in. But they were conscious that the word included *moral devotion and self-surrender to Christ*, a *firm conviction* that by uniting themselves to Him they would find remission of sins and eternal salvation, and *intellectual conviction* that certain divinely revealed facts are true."

In conversion, then, repentance and faith are the two essential factors, whether we consider it from the Scriptural or from a psychological standpoint. The passage " repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ " (Acts xx. 21) sums up the necessary conditions in this first crisis in the spiritual life.

The foregoing examination of these two

acts or states shows how they both spring from the depths of personality when influenced by divine grace. The revelation of the holy will of God in the moral law brings home to the human conscience the sense of sin and leads to repentance; the revelation of the love and goodness of God in the person of Christ awakens in man's heart a feeling of trust in him. The issue of these dual experiences, in purposeful action to forsake the evil and attain the good, is conversion. It may be viewed as the result of the divine influences, but it is essentially man's own act of turning. It is the expression of man's deepest-felt want in moral action. In cases of sudden conversion, such as that of Paul, it seems as though the transition were entirely of divine origination; but in the more usual and more deliberative cases of conversion the initial steps are consciously taken by the human agent under the influence of divine grace. " Conversion is both a turning and being turned." The power comes from God, the exercise of that power is of man's free will—" by grace have ye been saved through faith " (Eph. ii. 8).

Conversion, in which the power of God and the free will of man so mysteriously combine, is a self-determination in accordance with the saving purposes of the Spirit of God. The divine act of turning and changing man, viewed in its completeness, is called Regeneration. When the grace of God, through the Holy Spirit, moves the emotional part of man's nature to " godly sorrow " and stirs his will to forsake sin, a new principle of life is imparted to the human personality. Thereby man lives anew. He is a " new creation " and has come into possession of " eternal life."

CHAPTER X

THE REGENERATE MAN

THE new regenerate life into which the
human personality passes at conversion
may be viewed from many different stand-
points. This variety of aspect is reflected
in the language of the N.T. in describing it.
Interpreted by the sacrificial economy, it is
Redemption and Reconciliation. In terms
of life it is the New Birth or Eternal Life.
Mysticism sees in it Union with Christ and
Fellowship with Him. Religious devotion
views it as Consecration and Sanctification.
These and many other modes of speech
reveal the attempt of the N.T. writers to
express the fulness and richness of the
spiritual experience into which the human
personality emerges from the crisis of Con-
version. But behind the diversity of de-
scription and the complexity of incipient

doctrine resulting therefrom * there lies a
unity for which it is difficult to find a name.
That of " regeneration " has been generally
adopted as the one most suitable to express
the unity of the organic process.

Paul describes it as attaining " unto the
full-grown man " (Eph. iv. 13) ; as putting
on " the new man " (Eph. iv. 24), or more
fully, putting off " the old man " and putting
on " the new man which is being renewed
after the image of Him that created him "
(Col. iii. 10).   Paul believed that the human
personality could, as by a divine alchemy,
be transmuted, and the " natural man "
could become the " spiritual man."   Start-
ing from this Pauline conception of the
" new man " and examining the variety
of phrases used in the N.T. to describe the
effect of Christianity upon human nature,
it is possible to discover a fairly harmonious
N.T. view as to the state and possibilities
of man under these new conditions.   " There

must be a unifying principle," says Dr. Inge,* " in which the different activities of our nature are harmonised as activities of *one* person, directed towards one satisfying end. It is in this unifying experience that Faith for the first time comes fully into its own."

The word " grace " unifies the diversity of divine operations on man, and the word " faith " expresses the total human response to God's saving influence. But what shall we call the human agent that makes this response and attains thereby to a higher life ? The N.T. conception translated into modern speech teaches that he is a new personality. Not that any new element is added to man, nor that any change is made in the constitution of human nature, nor that man's personality is displaced ; but the N.T. teaches that man becomes a new personality through being placed in a new relationship to God, and filled with a new principle of life and action, in consequence of which he exercises all his natural faculties and powers in a new way.

* *Faith and its Psychology*, p. 231.

1. The New Man as Morally Rectified

Faith brings man into a new relationship to God and the moral law. This is called by Paul "justification." This new relationship is made possible by the objective fact of the expiatory death of Christ. Sin has estranged man from God. Through the revelation of the moral law there has come the knowledge of sin (Rom. iii. 20). But redemption is God's way of restoring men to righteousness. From a consciousness of sin man may by faith in Christ pass into a consciousness of righteousness.

Justification may be viewed, according to Pauline teaching, as a judicial act of God whereby He applies the benefits of the Atonement in Christ to the believer and declares him righteous. On the other hand, justification may be viewed as a state of man in which he is made righteous and brought into conformity to the divine law. The former is imputed righteousness, the latter is imparted righteousness. Both are the result of divine grace, and both may be appropriated by faith. Paul speaks of a man " being justified freely by God's grace

through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood " (Rom. iii. 24, 25). This passage connects justification with the redemptive work of Christ and makes it spring from free divine grace. The place of faith as both the condition and instrument of justification appears in many passages, *e.g.* " To him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness " (Rom. iv. 5 ; see also iii. 21, 22, 26, 28, v. 1 ; Gal. ii. 16).

The forensic aspect of justification, as pardon in harmony with law, concerns us less here than its ethical outcome in righteousness of life. The former predominates in Paul's Epistles, but the latter is not omitted. Faith not only puts man right with God through the appropriation of the saving benefits of Christ's death, but it brings man into vital relation with God, whereby he actually attains inward and outward conformity to the moral law. Faith works by love (Gal. v. 6), and self-surrendering faith is the condition of the Holy Spirit's indwelling whereby alone " the

requirements of the law are fulfilled " in those " who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit " (Rom. viii. 4). James insists that " faith apart from works is dead " (ii. 26), and John says that whosoever abideth in God " sinneth not " (1 John iii. 6). The idea of imparted righteousness involves, however, a deeper work of divine grace in man than can be expressed in such a legal conception as justification. And so we are led to consider a second aspect under which the human personality appears in the N.T. teaching.

2. The Spiritual Renewal of Personality

The human personality, according to the N.T., has within it the capacity for undergoing an inward transformation and renewal. Man has a spirit which renders him open to the influences of the Divine Spirit. As the Spirit of God went forth in creation, as the principle of order and life into the world, so the Holy Spirit operates directly upon the spirit of man, communicating to him power for moral recovery from the disorder of sin and infusing into him the principle

of a new and higher life. This is the very essence of the N.T. teaching about the personality of man. Man is conceived of, not as a finite, self-centred being, living a life on the earth with other animals, or, at best, sharing a self-conscious life with his fellow-men. He is a spiritual personality, made in the divine image, and in the very constitution of his nature akin to God. In man God has left Himself a way of approach and a ground for moral renovation.

Dr. Laidlaw (*The Bible Doctrine of Man*, p. 249) says that in the rise of the new life in the soul " the supernatural scheme of the Bible emerges in human experience. The religion of revelation—a system of supernatural facts—touches at this point the natural scheme of man and his being ; for the supernatural, in this form of a personal spiritual change, becomes a fact of consciousness."

This spiritual renewal is called a " new birth " in the Fourth Gospel. It is being " born anew," or " from above " (John iii. 3, 7). That a spiritual and divinely wrought renewal is meant appears from the phrase in the same context, " to be born of the

Spirit." The man who undergoes this change is " born of the Spirit " (ver. 8), or " born of God " (i. 13). The emphasis is not merely upon the change as initial, but upon the inherent nature of the Christian life as divinely originated. It is God's self-communication of Himself to man. The Fourth Gospel gives no psychological analysis of the new spiritual state, but speaks of it comprehensively as " eternal life." It is the life of God in the soul. " I came that they may have life, and may have it more abundantly," says Christ (x. 10).

In the Pauline Epistles the new regenerate life is represented under a variety of forms.

From the standpoint of its divine origin it is a *new moral creation*. A man may become a " new creature " (2 Cor. v. 17 ; Gal. vi. 15), or a " new creation," giving proof thereof in outward conduct. He is " created in Christ Jesus for good works " (Eph. ii. 10). *It is an intellectual renewal.* As a mental process it involves being " *renewed* in the spirit of your mind " (Eph. iv. 24), or " *transformed by* the *renewal* of your mind " (Rom. xii. 2), or being " *renewed* unto knowledge " (Col. iii. 10). The Agent of

this change is the Divine Spirit ; for it is being saved through the " renewing of the Holy Spirit " (Titus iii. 5).

In terms of the death and resurrection of Christ it is *a spiritual resurrection or quickening.* " God . . . quickened us together with Christ . . . and raised us up with him " (Eph. ii. 5, 6 ; *cf.* Col. ii. 13, iii. 1).

The initiatory rite of Baptism, with which the Christian life began, suggested to Paul the dying unto sin and the rising again with Christ, " We were buried with him through Baptism into death ; that like as Christ was raised from the dead, so we might walk in newness of life. For if we have become united with him by the likeness of his death, we shall be also [united with him] by the likeness of his resurrection " (Rom. vi. 4, 5). There is more than analogy, however, in this representation of change wrought in man, and leads on to a consideration of the last and deepest view of Paul in the matter.

The Christian life is one of *mystical union and fellowship with Christ.* The phrase " in Christ " occurs very frequently in the Pauline literature, and means " in fellowship with Christ." Christ is also said to be in us.

The mysticism of the Apostle is expressed most fully in the passage " I have been crucified with Christ : yet I live ; *and yet* no longer I, but Christ liveth in me " (Gal. ii. 20). This fellowship is possible because the regenerate man receives the life of the Spirit of God, which is also " the Spirit of Christ " (Rom. viii. 9 ; Gal. iv. 6). The Fourth Gospel contains many passages in which the mystical union of the believer with Christ is set forth : " Abide in me, and I in you " (John xv. 4), " I pray . . . that they also may be in us " (John xvii. 21).

These various representations of the change wrought in man show it to be the birth of a new personality or type of manhood that is Christlike and spiritual. Dr. Vernon Bartlet says,* " The Pauline doctrine of regeneration contains the essence of its author's unique experience of Jesus the Christ, as effecting at once revolution and renovation in his inner life . . . the life in him was above all, new ; and it was of divine initiation or grace. But that did not mean that there was no psychological continuity between the old Saul and his

* Hastings' *Dictionary of Bible*, vol. iv. p. 218.

faculties and the new Paul and his ; nor did it exclude the responsible co-operation of his own volitions throughout. . . . When he speaks of a ' new creature ' (Gal. vi. 15 ; 2 Cor. v. 17), or says ' the old things are passed away ; behold, they are become new,' he simply means that his experience had utterly changed in colour and perspective. No factor had been eliminated ; but the resultant was new ; and this by the operation of a new factor determining all afresh and in a new synthesis. The new factor was the quickening grace of God in Christ. This . . . made him a new man in Christ Jesus."

One conscious experience of the regenerate life is called "adoption." Paul says that the whole redemptive purpose of God was " that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father " (Gal. iv. 6). Regeneration, in renewing the human personality, gives to man a new filial self-consciousness, " The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are children of God " (Rom. viii. 16).

It is the divine grace that makes re-generation possible and bestows upon the new man in Christ the privilege of sonship— " Behold what manner of love the Father has bestowed upon us, that we should be called children of God ; and such we are " (1 John iii. 1). " Adoption," like " justifi-cation," is a legal term, and denotes man's new relation to God. And yet it is closely connected with regeneration as the bestowal of the consciousness and privilege of the new life.

3. The Sanctification of Manhood

Human personality, under the teaching and influence of Christianity, takes on a new value and is invested with deep religious significance. The new life that is infused into man is none other than the Spirit of God. The new type of manhood that re-sults therefrom is called by Paul " putting on Christ," or Christ being formed within him. Personality is a sacred thing. We have seen how the Gospels record that Jesus treated human personality, even in the smallest child or most abandoned outcast, as of inestimable worth. He discerned with-

in each human being the potentialities of
personality. Beneath the most forbidding
exterior there were lying latent powers of
goodness and of service, only waiting for the
regenerating influence of the Spirit to bring
them to life. In the rest of the N.T.
writings we see personality coming to its
own under the condition which redemption
provided. The call of the Gospel causes man
to turn from sin, that mars the divine image
within him and that robs him of the highest
prerogative of personality—viz. freedom.
The grace of God freely forgives and vir-
tually restores man, until he awakes to the
consciousness that he has become what
Christ's insight discerned as the true self
within him. The redeeming love of God in
Christ has wrought the great change. The
new man in Christ is a consecrated being.
Christ " died for all, that they which live
should no longer live unto themselves, but
unto him, who for their sakes died and
rose again " (2 Cor. v. 15).

The term " sanctification " is used for
various ideas that express this new con-
sciousness which Christianity implanted in
its followers. Justification and regenera-

16

tion are largely initial acts of divine grace. But sanctification is a state of growth and covers the whole development of moral character.

The former are contemporaneous, though separable in thought; the latter is progressive, culminating in holiness of character and conduct. Sanctification is primarily spoken of as a blessing imparted under the covenant of grace, and secondarily as a personal effort and attainment. The sanctifying agent is the Holy Spirit. The sanctified personality constitutes the **N.T.** "saint."

On its negative side, sanctification is purification from sin. Believers are justified or legally forgiven, the regenerate are spiritually constituted men, but the sanctified are cleansed both from the consciousness of guilt and from the defilement of sin. The old Levitical economy made provision for ceremonial cleansing by the sprinkling of blood, but, says the writer to the Hebrews, " how much more shall the blood of Christ . . . cleanse your conscience " (Heb. ix. 14). To the Corinthians Paul said, " Let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of

flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God " (2 Cor. vii. 1).

The positive side of sanctification consists in the consecration of the whole personality to God. As a strictly human act it is dedication, the dedicated person being consecrated by the Holy Spirit. This idea sprang from former ceremonial consecration of places, seasons, or utensils for the divine possession and use. These were entirely separated from secular use and set apart for God only. And so of the community of believers that constitute the Christian Church it is said, " Christ loved the Church . . . that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it . . . that he might present the Church to himself " (Eph. v. 26, 27).

In other places it is spoken of as the duty of individuals to " present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service " (Rom. xii. 1), or " present yourselves unto God . . . and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God " (Rom. vi. 13). Christians are " living stones " forming a spiritual temple, a holy priesthood to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God, through Jesus

Christ " (1 Pet. ii. 5). The sense of dignity and sanctity attaching to the new Christian personality is expressed in the idea that a man is " a vessel unto honour, sanctified, meet for the Master's use, prepared unto every good work " (2 Tim. ii. 21).

The ethical idea dominates the sanctification of human personality. The phraseology is drawn from the temple service and suggests ceremonial cleansing and dedication to God, but the thought that runs through the N.T. is that of purification from sin and moral dedication to the divine service. The ethical warnings and exhortations of the N.T. writers against fornication, idolatry, and other immoralities are based upon the inherent sanctity and potential holiness of the personality. All the followers of Christ are " called *to be* saints." The whole man is to be consecrated in each of his constituent parts—" the God of peace Himself sanctify you wholly, and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Faithful is He that called you, who also will do it " (1 Thess. v. 23, 24). This deep religious significance attaching to human personality as

something purified by God and set apart as instrumental in carrying out the divine purpose in the world makes human life sacramental. The self, according to the N.T., is not merely a social self developing in a community of other finite selves; it is a divine self realising its ideal powers of service, and fulfilling its destiny only in a fellowship with " the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ " (1 John i. 3).

PART III

COMPARATIVE CONCEPTIONS OF PERSONALITY

CHAPTER XI

THE CHRISTIAN PERSONALITY

HÖFFDING has said, " The concept of personality must always constitute the central thought of psychology." * Here philosophy and psychology meet in seeking to answer the age-long question, " What is man ? " The contribution which the Bible has made to the solution of the problem can easily be undervalued because it is so often unrecognised. " The Christian doctrine of man," says Prof. Wheeler Robinson, " has so passed into the common stock of our higher Western thought as to be the chief formative influence in our conception of personality. Our familiarity with it, our unconscious dependence upon it, may result in the failure to do justice to it." †

The foregoing examination of the leading

* *Problems of Philosophy*, p. 20.
† *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, p. 3.

ideas contained in the psychological ter-
minology of the New Testament, and the
psychological implications of the religious
experiences which it reflects, lead us not
only to consider " What is man ? " but
also to inquire " What may man become ? "
The conception of human personality which
the N.T. reflects is both an actuality and
an ideal of manhood. The conception is
not unfolded in terms of modern philo-
sophical language, but the elements for such
a treatment, the presuppositions of a Chris-
tian philosophy of personality, lie scattered
thick through all the pages of the various
books. Some of these scattered ideas we
have gleaned from the psychological lan-
guage and experiences of the sacred writers,
others we have found in the actions and
words of Jesus and his followers, and it is
now for us to gather these together as data
for a synthetic view of the Christian per-
sonality.

That which gives unity and consistency
to the Christian ideas on the subject is the
underlying presupposition of man's spiritual
relationship to God. It is true that the
N.T. treats of man almost exclusively from

the moral and religious standpoint, yet a synthesis of its teaching may be made by reviewing it in the light of the modern philosophic conception of personality.

1. The concept of personality involves primarily the thought of life. A person is to be distinguished from an inanimate thing. According to the N.T., the principle of life is the direct result of the divine inbreathing. The soul is spirit embodied in a living organism. It is God-given, though shared also by the animals.

2. Personality presupposes consciousness. The life or soul is more than mere animation. It is conscious life. The N.T. teaches that the soul is the seat of feeling. The animals share with man this life of sensation, and yet, according to Jesus, a man is of more value than the bird or the beast. What is it that distinguishes him from other animals ? It is his inherent worth as a child of God. The image of God, in which the O.T. taught that man was created, consisted in spiritual likeness to God. The soul in man, then, is not merely the seat of feeling, it becomes in him the capacity for desire after God and for communion with Him. Each man

stands in a vital spiritual relationship to God. It is through this higher life of the soul, upon which Jesus had insisted, that the principle of individuality came to recognition.

3. The fundamental characteristic of personality is self-consciousness. It is that through which man distinguishes himself from the various activities of his being. It is the quality whereby the self can be made an object of reflection. The subject of all mental processes may become an object to itself. In the N.T. generally, as in the O.T., the " heart " is regarded as the focal centre of the conscious life of the " soul," but it is in his " spirit " that man comes to true self-consciousness. And as the " spirit " in man is, throughout Scripture, the higher side of the self, and is regarded as coming directly from God (who Himself *is* Spirit), self-consciousness is a divinely imparted power. Thus amidst the flux of thoughts, desires, and acts of will there is a personal centre in man's conscious life which has a unity and identity which constitute him truly man and most like to God among terrestrial beings.

4. The quality of self-consciousness gives rise to the power of self-determination, which is another essential feature in personality. The man himself can stand aloof from the manifold of his experience. He can pass judgment on his own actions, control his appetite, and organise his thinking processes, exercising thereby the sovereign power of self-determination.   The N.T. does not express this truth quite in this way, but it regards man as possessing moral freedom and as responsible for his actions.   It is true that he is enslaved by sin, which dominates him from the bodily-sensuous side of his nature, called the " flesh " ; but the " inward man " or the " nous " still delights in the law of God. By the grace of God desires after goodness still arise within the soul, and the faculty of willing still survives and " conscience " still pronounces moral judgment.   The N.T. teaches that through Christ man is redeemed from sin, and may attain through the indwelling Spirit true freedom—a liberty, as Canon Ottley says (*Christian Ideas and Ideals*, p. 73), " not merely of the will, but of the entire personality."

5. The continuity of the personal subject which is implied in the unifying principles of self-consciousness and self-determination is emphasised in the N.T. Man is not only one and the same through all the changes of his earthly life, but his personality persists even after death. The moral issues of the earthly life will appear in eternity. On his fleshly side man may be subject to the law of decay and dissolution, but through his spiritual nature and his kinship with God he is immortal. And it is the whole personality that survives, not any fragmentary part of his nature. The doctrine of the resurrection of the dead involves the continuity even of the body, raised, however, a " spiritual " body in incorruption and in glory.

6. The social aspect of personality is not wanting in the N.T. ideas regarding man. If the Christian teaching has given prominence to the principle of individuality, it has not overlooked the universal element in man which links him in fellowship with other men. The weakest and humblest have rights which must be respected, but every man has duties to other human beings in the

family and in the state.   Moreover, though the lowliest and most sinful have worth in the sight of God, yet this can only become actual in the Kingdom of God and in the life of His Church upon earth.   The principles enunciated in the N.T. set each man as a member in a universal brotherhood, and the fellowship which is " in Christ " dissolves the barriers of caste and race.

7. But the distinctive feature of the N.T. teaching concerning man is its profound insight into moral evil and its exalted views as to the possibilities of human personality under the saving influences of God's Spirit. Sin and sanctification are the two extremes to which personality may go.   Out of the former, through the redemption that is in Christ, man may attain unto the latter. By self-denial, or the renunciation of the lower sinful self, man may reach a higher selfhood in which the law of the spirit of life in Christ-Jesus becomes the determining principle of all his actions, saving him from the law of sin and of death.   He can then say with Paul, " I live ; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me."   This deliverance from sin and experience of salvation involves

such a radical change in man that it is called the "new birth" or a "new creation." Although no new element is introduced into man's nature, yet through his spirit the Divine Spirit gains unrestricted access, imparting new principles of action and, taking full possession of the man, producing a new moral nature in him. The crisis in which a man by repentance and faith yields himself up to God is called "conversion," the renewing process initiated by God's grace and brought to completion by His Spirit is called "regeneration." Emerging out of this experience the regenerate man has the consciousness of pardon and reconciliation, and regards himself thenceforward as a personality consecrated to God and devoted to the divine service. Holy love becomes the highest motive in the life of the "spiritual" man, for God is "Spirit" and God is "Love."

Finally, the N.T. reveals that human personality is not the outcome of merely natural processes. It is the impress of the divine nature and that which man shares with God.

Its three elements of thought, will, and

love are the counterparts in man of reason, purpose, and redemption which reveal God in nature and in history. Nor is the human personality limited by a physical environment; it develops within a spiritual realm. It is open to God and capable of eternal life.

The positive account of the N.T. idea of personality has now been set forth in its main outlines. But seeing that its distinctive features must stand out more clearly when compared with other phases of thought, we shall proceed to institute such a comparison as regards Judaism and Hellenism before attempting to estimate its relations to modern conceptions of personality.

17

CHAPTER XII

THE N.T. conception of human personality grew out of that contained originally in the O.T., and has many points in common with it, especially in the matter of psychological terminology. But for purposes of comparison and contrast, the main Jewish ideas as to the nature of man need to be gathered up in a brief survey. These ideas are to be found in the O.T., which reflect the older Hebrew conception, and in the extra-canonical books of the Apocryphal and Apocalyptic writers, which contain the views of later Judaism. These two sources show that a development of thought was going on for centuries before the Christian era. The O.T. retains in many of its terms the vestiges of the crude reflections common to all primitive

peoples when they begin to think about themselves. It shows also a deepening of the idea of personality in the writings of the prophets. The language of earlier times is filled with a new content as the importance and worth of the individual emerges amid national disaster and dissolution. The process is carried a step further in the extra-canonical writings. Israel was no longer an isolated nation. New and diverse influences were at work modifying both language and thought. The Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic literature of the first two centuries B.C. and of the first century A.D. reflects a state of flux in psychological terminology and anthropological conceptions, and yet a steady advance in the central idea of the nature and worth of the human personality.

The Jewish view of man, amid many other variations, regards him as a duality consisting of two parts—physical and spiritual. The physical part was called " flesh " (בָּשָׂר), the Hebrews having, strictly speaking, no term for the living body. The spiritual part of man was called either " soul " or " spirit " (רוּחַ or נֶפֶשׁ).

1. THE SEAT OF PERSONALITY

To what part of man did the Hebrews conceive the personality to belong? We can answer—the Soul. Dr. A. B. Davidson (*The Theology of the Old Testament*, pp. 200, 201) says, " No doubt the individuality or personality is attributed to the נֶפֶשׁ." It is " the bearer of the personality . . . it *has* or *is* the personality."

The idea of the personality residing in the soul arose out of the very early anthropological speculations which regarded the soul as primarily the seat of life. The soul is that in man which lives. When reflecting on the difference between a dead body and a living one, men came to see that death was caused by the loss of blood, by the loss of breath, or by the loss of both. The life, then, was in the blood or in the breath. The soul is the life within an organism. Tylor * has drawn attention to this identification of the soul or life with the blood and the breath amongst primitive peoples, and his ideas have been confirmed by the observations of many other anthropologists.

* *Primitive Culture*, ed. 3, vol. i. p. 432.

That the early Hebrews shared in this widespread belief is apparent from many considerations. The derivation of the O.T. word for soul (viz. *nephesh*, נֶפֶשׁ, literally " that which breathes ") suggests that it was originally identified with the breath. A dead person was believed to be reanimated by the breath returning to him (1 Kings xvii. 22).

The prohibition against eating blood was because " the life of the flesh was in the blood " (Lev. xvii. 11), or " the blood is the life " (Deut. xii. 23), and so it was offered to God. The heart, being the receptacle of the blood, was therefore thought of psychologically as " the focus of the personal life " (Laidlaw), the centre of man's personality. Hence " the heart was regarded as the organ of thought—a man without intelligence was a heartless man (Hos. vii. 11). . . . Thought is not ascribed directly to the soul, though a certain limited intelligence is " (Charles, *Enc. Bib.*, c. 1339).

The soul throughout the O.T. is chiefly the seat of the sensibilities, appetites, and emotions. As that which feels and lives in man, the " soul " came to be used as an

expression of the conscious life of the individual. A man, instead of saying " I," would say " my soul." In enumeration, so many " souls " meant so many persons. Even a deceased person was therefore called " a soul " (a dead body, נֶפֶשׁ מֵת, Num. vi. 6; Lev. xxi. 11).

The Apocryphal and Apocalyptic literature carried on this identification of the personality with the soul, although there was growing up in this period the practice of using " spirit " as the bearer of the personality also. We have already seen how in N.T. times the word " soul " was still used to express the idea of the personality.

But the N.T. teaching, as it comes to fullest expression in the Pauline literature, makes it abundantly clear that while " soul " may be popularly used for the self, it is " spirit " which is constitutive of the new personality of the regenerate man. The experiences of the new life in fellowship with Christ soon made it evident that the antithesis recognised generally between soul and body was not enough, a new antithesis was needed to be expressed—that, viz., be-

tween the natural and the supernatural in
man. And so we get the Pauline antithesis,
that finds an echo in both James and Jude,
of the natural and the spiritual—the soul
is the life-centre of the natural man's
conscious activity, but the spirit is the
life-centre of all the thoughts and volitions
of the spiritual man. "The contrast or
antithesis," says Laidlaw (*Bible Doctrine of
Man*, p. 94), " is plainly one between human
nature in its own native element and
human nature under the higher power
which has entered it in the new birth. The
former is *psychic*, the latter is *pneumatic*.
The psychical or ' soulish ' man is man as
nature now constitutes him and as sin has
infected him. . . . The pneumatic or spiritual
man is man as grace has reconstituted him,
and as God's Spirit dwells in him and
bestows gifts upon him." Paul had no
occasion to coin a new word to denote that
in the regenerate man which constituted his
new personality. The needed term was
already in current use, and the meaning
which the Apostle wished to express by it
was already implicit in the word. That
word was " spirit." It was already used

in the O.T. as something in both God and
man. But with this difference—Spirit was
of God's essence, but in man it was derived.
As we have seen, " soul " was " spirit "
under human conditions. The human
spirit was but the God-given principle of
the life, and therefore the Godward aspect
of the soul. Hence when the principle of
the Christian personality needed a term
that would indicate its immediate origina-
tion from God and its essential affinity with
the divine nature, the word " spirit " was
ready to hand. The centre of the believer's
personality was shifted from the earthly
" soul " to the heavenly " spirit "—and the
Holy Spirit of God possessed and ruled and
filled the spirit of the " new man in Christ
Jesus."

Sometimes the word " spirit " is used in
connection with the experience of the Chris-
tian life in such a way as to make it im-
possible to decide when the Apostle is
speaking of God's Spirit or of the Divine
Spirit subjectively appropriated by the faith
of the believer. So often, in fact, is this
the case that Biblical exegetes have been
led to declare that Paul does not teach

that there is a human spirit at all. But this contention is not borne out by an examination of all his uses of the word " pneuma." Still, the interaction of the human and the Divine Spirit is regarded by Paul as so intimate that often it is impossible to know to which he refers.

In this point, then, the N.T. idea of human personality differs from the Jewish—viz. in shifting the centre of personality from the soul as derived, to the spirit as directly coming, from God, and is an advance upon it. The two views are not contradictory. The Christian idea is but the logical outcome of the Gospel teaching that Christ is a life-giving Spirit that may dwell in the believer.

2. PERSONALITY AND GOD

If the Hebrews closely identified the soul with the breath and the blood, they did not hold that it was produced by any physical processes. All their conceptions about the world and about man were dominated by the belief in God and in the divine creation of all things. The dualistic theories of other ancient peoples, that the world and

God, matter and mind, soul and body, were irreconcilable and antagonistic to each other, were foreign to Jewish modes of thought. Man, according to the O.T., is a duality of body and soul, but both alike were created by God. The body was formed by God from the dust which He had previously created, and into the earthly body God directly breathed the breath of life, and then man became a living soul (Gen. ii. 7). The "breath of life" (נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים) mentioned in this passage is called " spirit of life " (רוּחַ חַיִּים) in Gen. vi. 17, vii. 15.

In man, this animating Spirit gives life to the mind, and so man himself is said to have a spirit. " There is a spirit in man, and the breath of the Almighty giveth him understanding " (Job xxxii. 8). Through the possession of spirit, man derives his origin from God and is akin to God. It must not be supposed that any difference in substance between " soul " and " spirit " was thought of as existing in man. They are two aspects of the one thing. The soul is the individual life, the spirit is the life as given by God. But God's Spirit was also God's power. So man's spirit is the soul

" as possessing or showing power, elevation." *

The first creation narrative (Gen. i.) also emphasises the fact that man is derived directly from the result of the divine creative act, whereas other living creatures are produced indirectly by the earth. The animals were created each "after its kind," but man in the image and likeness of God. The Jews believed in the personality, spirituality, and holiness of God. And man, being created in the divine image, was a personal being possessing a spiritual and moral nature akin to God.

This view that the personality of man is the result of the direct creative power of God characterises the whole of Jewish thinking, and forms the basis of all Jewish worship. But the idea of communion between man and God passed through several stages of development. In the naïve anthropomorphism of early Hebrew literature the personal communion between man and God was believed to be very close and intimate. In the later priestly developments of Jewish thought, man's approach

* Davidson, *The Theology of the O.T.* p. 202.

to God was conditioned by an elaborate ritual and sacrificial system. And in the final stages of Judaism before the Christian era, God was thought of as Absolute Spirit. He was so sovereign and transcendent that other personal beings, angels or spirits, were conceived of as mediating between God and man.

Hence, though the Jewish conviction—that human personality was derived from God and akin to the Divine Personality—remained, the gulf that separated man from God widened as the years went by. The cleavage between the natural and the supernatural, the finite and the infinite, deepened. However much the idea of the worth of human personality gained from other considerations, it lost in the matter of immediate vital and inward relationship to the Divine Personality.

The N.T. idea of human personality has its foundation in the O.T. doctrine that man is a spiritual being created in the image of God. But by its doctrine of God the N.T. is able to show that man may stand in a new relationship to the divine. Jesus, in

teaching the Fatherhood and love of God, revealed a new aspect of the Divine Personality to the hearts of men. That the O.T. contained many adumbrations of the truth cannot be denied. But the unfolding of the truth of God's love in both the words and deeds of Jesus gave it concrete utterance in human history and experience. " God having . . . spoken in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in His Son " (Heb. i. 1). In contrast with the Jewish view of the divine transcendence, the teaching of Jesus, that God is the Father of mankind and that the Kingdom of Heaven was open to all who fulfilled the moral conditions of membership therein, brought man into personal and intimate relationship with God. Access to God was the privilege of human personality as such. It was not the exclusive privilege of the Jew, in virtue of his national descent or his ritual observances. It was the right of man as the child of God. The teaching of Jesus in this respect seemed so subversive of all Jewish religious doctrines, that when first announced it aroused resentment among

the Pharisees and elders of the nation. But when the death of Jesus was viewed by N.T. writers in the light of the Jewish doctrine of Atonement, it was seen that Jesus not only announced the possibility of approach to God, but had himself opened up a " new and living way to the Father."

The resurrection of Christ and his continued existence as the Mediator of the new covenant showed that " he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near to God, seeing that he ever liveth to make intercession for them " (Heb. vii. 25). And the gift of the Spirit made it possible for the Apostle to say to people of other nations, " Through him we both [Jews and Gentiles] have our access in one Spirit unto the Father " (Eph. ii. 18).

Thus in the N.T. human personality was viewed in a new light as touching its relation to the Divine Personality. The naïve anthropomorphism of early views, which was broken up by the teaching and ceremonialism of later Judaism, was transfigured into the higher anthropomorphism of the N.T., which was based upon the kin-

ship of spirit existing between the " Father of Spirits " and the spirit of the individual man. " The teaching of Jesus contrasts with that of the greatest Jewish prophets," says Edward Caird,* " in so far as it is a preaching of reconciliation with God . . . on the basis of an original unity. God is represented, not in a passing figure, but in a title which is supposed to express His essential nature, as the Father of men. . . . The sense of alienation and distance from God, which had grown upon the pious in Israel . . . is declared to be no longer in place. . . . The sense of the division of man from God, as a finite being from the infinite, as weak and sinful from the omnipotent goodness, is not indeed lost ; but it can no longer overpower the consciousness of oneness. The terms Son and Father at once state the opposition and mark its limits. They show that it is not an absolute opposition, but one which presupposes an indestructible principle of unity, that can and must become a principle of reconciliation."

* *Evolution of Religion*, vol. ii. pp. 145-7.

3. THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE COMMUNITY

A further comparison between the Jewish and N.T. views about human personality appears in the matter of the relation of the individual to society. The Hebrews looked upon the individual as an integral part of the community, but in a state of subordination to it. Each man was by birth a member of a family, each family had its place as a part of a tribe, and the tribe was further looked upon as subordinate to the nation. The unit to be considered was the nation as a whole. The chosen people, and not the individual person, stood in a covenant relation to Jahweh. Prosperity depended upon national obedience to the law of God; punishment for transgression would fall upon the people as a whole. This conception was doomed to modification under stress of outward circumstance. The unity of the nation was first of all broken up by the rebellion of Jeroboam and the defection of the ten tribes of northern Israel. The breaking-up of the nation was followed by a growing consciousness of the responsibility of the individuals, that composed

either N. Israel or Judah, for the welfare of their respective kingdoms.

There arose under these conditions prophets like Isaiah, Hosea, and Amos, proclaiming the necessity of personal righteousness. When the ten northern tribes disappeared into captivity, Judah became the national unit. When Judah's existence was threatened by Babylon and during the Captivity which followed, isolated thinkers like Jeremiah and Ezekiel discerned indeed the worth of each man in the sight of God. Following the Captivity " the individual rose to his own proper place and rights, and felt his own worth and responsibility " (Davidson, art. " Eschatology," Hastings' *Dict. of Bible*, vol. i. p. 738).

But in later post-exilic times the restored people reorganised the national life and religious observances afresh, to the suppression of the individual. The Messianic hopes, that arose under fresh disaster, took the shape of a national salvation. The ideals of Pharisaic patriotism was the restoration of a theocracy. Veneration for the Torah, by obedience to which it was thought that the favour of God would be won for the

18

nation, led to such a complete and exacting system of ritual that goodness came to be measured by the observance of ceremony, and the worth of the individual by his capacity to live according to tradition. The authority of the Scribes and Pharisees imposed itself upon the individual conscience. Those who failed to observe the requirements of the law were looked upon as outcasts and sinners.

In contrast with the Jewish system, which subordinated the man to the nation, Christianity emphasised the worth of the individual. The proclamation by Jesus of the Fatherhood of God made men see that each one is a child of God, and therefore of inestimable value. The care of Jesus for the outcast and sinner, as we have seen, was based upon man's inherent and inalienable worth at his lowest and worst as a person— a son of God. Each man was regarded as an end in himself. But as a spiritual being man could not grow to perfection in a state of isolation from his fellow-men. If God is his Father, all men must stand in brotherly relation to one another. And so the N.T. shows us Christ proclaiming a kingdom, and

later it shows us Christianity organising believers into a Church. The divine society is not made up of human units that are self-seeking and exclusive, but of persons who, by dying to self, live for the good of all. The erring and the weak are not cast out, but are cared for and helped, for under the influence of the Spirit transformed personality may become the medium for manifestations of divine wisdom and power for the benefit of all. The anticipation of the prophet Joel was that God would pour forth His Spirit " upon all flesh," and that the Kingdom of God would be universal in its scope.

The gift of prophecy would be conferred even upon " bondmen " and " bondmaidens." The experience of Pentecost marked the beginning of this (Acts ii. 6). The spiritual gifts shared by the members of the early Church were the manifestations of the Spirit given to each " to profit withal " (1 Cor. xii. 7).

The true Israel was not an aggregate of law-abiding Pharisees, but a living body wherein all were members one of another. The idea of organic and spiritual relation-

ship to God carried with it the idea of organic relationship of man with man. The moral exclusiveness of Pharisaism was to be transcended by the spiritual inclusiveness of love ; the national individualism of the Jew to give place to the universalism of the Church. In the later history of the Church it is true that the individual was subordinated again to the community.

" The more firmly the visible order was established," says Eucken (*The Life of the Spirit*, pp. 55, 59), " and the closer it linked the invisible order to itself, the greater was the loss which the freedom of the individual was bound to undergo. . . . The centre of gravity of life is removed more and more from the soul of the individual, and the latter is treated as a mere appendage of the gigantic ecclesiastical system." Under these conditions the acts and beliefs of men took on a predominantly passive character. But this was historically a departure from the primitive N.T. conception as to the function of the individual personality within the spiritual community of the redeemed. That some measure of subordination is necessary to the life and welfare of the whole cannot

be doubted. But the freedom of the individual was safeguarded by the right of living and direct access to God by faith in Christ.

The spontaneity of spiritual expression was not to be checked by the weight of external authority. Believers constituted a holy priesthood. They were a kingdom of priests. Under the influence of the Spirit the lowliest might be able to edify the whole.

4. The Individual and Immortality

The O.T. can hardly be said to teach individual immortality. The Hebrew and Jewish ideas of the relation of the individual to the community determined the views about a future life. " One of the strangest things in the Old Testament is the little place which the individual feels he has, and the tendency is to lose himself in larger wholes, such as the tribe or the nation." *
This profoundly affected all eschatological beliefs. The man felt that his own future was bound up with the future of his nation as a whole ; he was blessed in the blessing

* Davidson in Hastings' *Dict. of Bible*, vol. i. p. 738.

that came to Israel. But after the Captivity the unit of religious value was the single person. The nation was broken up, but the man remained. Jahweh and a religious relation to Him also remained. Hence, all the hopes for the future that the prophets had proclaimed for the nation came to be more and more appropriated by the individual. Moreover, as the relation in which man stood to God came to be thought of as a moral one, based upon righteousness, it was felt that death could not sever the connection and that righteousness would deliver from death.

Indications of this change of view are apparent in the book of Job and in some of the later Psalms.

A doctrine of resurrection in connection with the Messianic hope emerges in the book of Daniel, wherein the individual will be raised to share in the future blessedness of the nation. But in spite of these later signs of a growing conviction that each righteous man could hope to live after death, the belief was not general. Dr. Charles says, " Never in Palestinian Judaism down to the Christian era did the

doctrine of a merely individual immortality appeal to any but a few isolated thinkers" (*Enc. Bib.* vol. ii. art. " Eschatology ").

In the Apocalyptic literature the belief in future blessedness developed amid a great variety of conceptions which were often contradictory ; sometimes it is the individual, sometimes it is the nation that will be blessed. But in Christianity these conflicting views are harmonised under the conception of the Kingdom and the relation of the individual to Christ.

The resurrection of Christ was the great factor whereby " life and immortality were brought to light through the Gospel." Around the person of Christ the hopes of individual immortality gathered, and in the idea of the heavenly Kingdom the hopes of a collective blessedness centred. The individual would live after death through living union with Christ. But immortality was not to be a solitary existence beyond the grave, but one in fellowship with others who had also been united by faith with Christ. The N.T. teaches, not so much an individual, as a personal immortality in a society of the spirits of " just men made

perfect." In contrast with the O.T. view of man's future, the N.T. is permeated throughout with a clear and definite hope of immortality; and in contrast with the Jewish conceptions that grew up in the period immediately before the Christian era, the N.T. teaching presents a doctrine that is based upon man's spiritual kinship with God and his living union with the risen Christ. The moral bearing of the N.T. doctrine is seen in its underlying conception of the responsibility of each man for his conduct in this life. It teaches that there will be a final judgment, that the wicked will suffer punishment, and that the righteous will be blessed. The future life will be determined by man's moral conduct here.

Although the language of the N.T. contains many modes of thought and figures of speech taken over from earlier times, yet its main idea of the immortality of the righteous as an individual, personal life in fellowship with Christ is consistent throughout.

CHAPTER XIII

CONTRAST BETWEEN GREEK AND CHRISTIAN
VIEWS

THE N.T. idea of human personality further
appears when it is compared with the lead-
ing Greek conceptions. It was really not
till modern times that the self was made
a subject of systematic reflection. The re-
cognition of personality as a philosophic
principle is the result of the thought and
criticism of centuries. But among the
peoples with which Christianity first came
into contact, the Greeks had thought most
deeply upon the nature of man. That they
did not arrive at a complete and satisfactory
view of human personality as a whole may
be admitted. " Even when we reach the
climax of ancient civilisation in Greece and
Rome," says Illingworth in his *Personality,
Human and Divine,* " there is no adequate

sense, either in theory or practice, of human personality as such." Still, the Greek philosophers had for several centuries before the Christian era been thinking about man, and by the time the N.T. came to be written, what may be called the Greek conception had taken definite shape and offers several points of contrast with the ideas which are contained in the Christian literature. It is not intended here to give a complete exposition of Greek thought on the nature and powers of man, but only to indicate those aspects which will help to throw into clearer relief the views arrived at, under the widely different conditions, by the writers of the N.T.

1. The Seat of Personality

In Greek thought the seat of personality was the soul. In the soul the rational part is the highest element. " Plato and Aristotle declared that reason constituted the real essence of man, . . . and that man's highest activity is thought." * The steps by which the rational soul came to be re-

* Zeller, *Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics*, p. 20.

garded as the true centre of man's being can be traced through the speculation of many earlier thinkers. Philosophical inquiry has always been marked by the attempt to find a principle of unity that will co-ordinate the multiplicity of experience. This appears in the first philosophers. The Ionic sages sought to find in the objective world some one thing—"water" or "air"—that would account for all things. The Pythagoreans sought in "number" the unifying principle. The Eleatic school, in saying that it was "being," reduced all things to appearance and prepared the way for Anaxagoras (5th century B.C.), who found in nous, or reason, that which is at once the moving principle in outward matter and the inward principle of all knowledge. The Sophists followed with their doctrine of subjectivity. "Man is the measure of all things," said Protagoras. Nothing can be known except by reference to the knowing mind, nothing need be done except what accords with the individual will. Against the idea that the truth or worth of a thing is dependent upon a subjective opinion Socrates fought with his keen dialectic, and

sought inductively to establish a rational and universal principle. This he found in thought. The Delphic oracle had said, " Know thyself." And Socrates found that if man looked but deeply enough into himself he would find that absolute standard of the true and the good, and that he could affirm that " Virtue is knowledge." Socrates greatly deepened the idea of personality by making it the organ of universal thought. Plato systematised the fragmentary teaching of his master. In his doctrine of "ideas" Plato developed the theory of the universal reason, and in the human soul found that which is of the same nature as the universal soul, or reason. Man consists of body and soul, but the seat of man's true personality is in his soul.

But in the human soul there are three principles, or faculties : (1) the lowest (τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν), lodged in the breast, is the sensational or appetitive, corresponding to the workers in the Republic ; (2) the highest, in the head (τὸ λογιστικόν), is the intellectual and rational, corresponding to the rulers or men of wisdom ; (3) intermediate, the spirited (τὸ θυμοειδές) or forceful

element, corresponding to the warriors in a State.

The mind, or reason, may enlist help of the spirited or irascible element to subdue the senses and lusts. As these latter are closely related to the body, it is the rational part of man which constitutes what is properly called the soul and which relates him to God, the Universal Reason. Aristotle has a clearer idea of the unity of the human personality than Plato. The chief attribute of man is still reason. The soul in which it resides is the entelechy (actuality or full realisation) of the body. The body is related to the soul, as form to matter, or as the potential to the actual, and so the soul is conceived of as manifesting itself in an ascending scale through the vegetative, animal, and rational faculties. It thus remains a unity co-ordinating mere sensation and impulse into knowledge and will. Man is an animal, but in his active, speculative reason he attains selfhood and likeness to God, whose self-consciousness Aristotle describes as " thinking upon thought." Both in Plato and Aristotle, however, the idea of the universal reason

is in danger of swamping the individual reason. The Stoics also believed that man had a soul, and that its primary power is reason (called by them τὸ ἡγεμονικόν). From reason all desires and feelings are derived, and in it is " the seat of personal identity, a point on which former philosophers had refrained from expressing an opinion " (Zeller, *op. cit.* p. 203). But the materialistic pantheism of the Stoics led them to regard the human soul as fiery breath, diffused through the body just as the universal reason or force is diffused through the world. Thus while they advanced beyond Plato and Aristotle in proclaiming the unity of the soul, their views as to the corporeal substance of the soul were more materialistic, and their belief that human reason was but the organ of a universal reason or force was more pantheistic. At first sight it appears as if the Jewish and primitive Christian teaching as to the soul being the seat of the personality were identical with the Greek. But this is not so, for the Greeks regarded reason and intellect as constituting the real essence of the soul, whereas the Judaic-Christian

view is that the essential function of the soul or self, central in the heart, is moral. That which characterises man in Jewish and Christian thought is conscience as the " practical reason," whereas in Hellenic speculation it is intellect as the "theoretical reason."

As we have seen, the later N.T. teaching goes beyond the Jewish and primitive Christian idea when it makes the pneuma the seat of personality in the regenerate man. And in this respect it differs totally from the Greek. "'Spirit' is an entirely original Biblical term for the highest aspect of man's life. It is almost inseparable from the idea of man's relation to God, whether in creation or in redemption . . . ' Spirit ' is not so used by Plato, by Philo, by the earlier Stoics, by Plotinus and the neo-Platonists, nor indeed anywhere out of the circle of Bible thought. It denotes the direct dependence of man upon God " (Laidlaw). Only under the influence of theistic belief do the claims of personality come to fitting recognition. The pantheistic tendencies of some Greek thinkers made it difficult for the idea of personality to assert

itself.   But in the theism of the N.T., where
not only the unity of God as a moral and
spiritual being is reaffirmed but His love
is made central, the foundations for an
adequate conception of human personality
are securely laid.

In the human *pneuma* or spirit man attains
to fullest self-consciousness and moral power
because it is the God-given principle of all
his thinking, feeling, and willing.

Other points of contrast may be mentioned
more briefly.

2.   PRE-EXISTENCE

The Pythagoreans believed in the trans-
migration of souls, and Plato developed the
idea of the pre-existence of the soul.   It
formed a part of his metaphysical system.
The rational part of the soul was immortal,
and therefore existed before the life of the
body which it inhabits.   His theory of
eternal ideas requires the eternal existence
of the soul which contemplates them, so
that the process of knowing is but a process
of reminiscence.   The Platonic doctrine of
pre-existence had a widespread influence in
ancient times, to some extent   influenced

Jewish thought, and we see it in a modified form in Philo. But the O.T. teaching as to the creation of man " directly contradicts the doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul." * And in the N.T. no ground whatever is given for believing in it. That the subject was exercising the mind of men is apparent from the question asked of Jesus about the man born blind, but the answer of our Lord makes it clear that no such doctrine found a place in his teaching. The Christian's look is a forward one. But in Oriental pantheism the look is backward. The problem for the Hindoo to-day is— " What was I ? " But the man who believes in the personality of God, and who realises the worth of human nature created in the divine image and sharing the Spirit in fellowship with Christ, is always asking, " What shall I become ? " And if the Apostle, while asserting, "now are we children of God," is bound to add, " it is not yet made manifest what we shall be," yet he is able confidently to say concerning God's future manifestation, " we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him even as He

* Schultz, *O.T. Theol.* vol. ii. p. 252.

19

is " (1 John iii. 2). This leads us to a third contrast.

3.   IMMORTALITY

Plato taught the immortality of the soul. Having reason, it was derived from God and is of the same nature and character as the soul of the world. Being divine, it is immortal. It is independent, self-moved, and free. It is a simple and incorruptible principle. It contemplated the eternal ideas, and having existed before has dim longings for the world of ideas as its proper home. Aristotle held that the soul was not wholly mortal. The vegetative and animal functions of the soul would perish with the body, but the intellect as active, creative Reason (which was immaterial, self-subsistent, and made man akin to God) was immortal. His view seems to require that any future existence of man would be " impersonal " rather than personal. The Stoics believed that the souls of some at least would live after death, but they denied that they would live for ever. At the end of the world the individual soul would be resolved into the universal world-soul. Much of

the Greek teaching about immortality is in harmony with the N.T., and especially that which grounds the belief in the nature of human personality and its community of essence with the divine. But there is a fundamental difference. Hellenic dualism regarded the body as evil, or at best as a prison-house or a clog to the soul. Death would be a release for the rational, imperishable soul from the evil, sensuous, and perishable body.

The N.T., on the other hand, teaches not bare immortality, but resurrection.* The future life will be a restoration of the whole man. The body will not be one of flesh and blood, but spiritual.† The Christian awaited his adoption, the redemption of the body ‡; he looked for a Saviour who would fashion anew the body of our humiliation so that it would be conformed to the body of his glory.‖ The difference between the Greek and Christian views is brought out clearly in the account given in Acts of Paul's preaching at Athens; when the men of

---

* Acts iv. 2 ; John v. 28, 29, vi. 54.
† 1 Cor. xv. 35-53.
‡ Rom. viii. 23.   ‖ Phil. iii. 21.

that city " heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked ; but others said, We will hear thee concerning this yet again " (Acts xvii. 32).

4. MORAL EVIL

A further point invites comparison between the Greek and N.T. views as to man's nature, viz. the relation of man to moral evil. The Hellenic philosophy was largely practical, the ethical aim often determining the speculative form. The quest of the good under such circumstances took pre-eminence of the search for the true. Hence the problem of the nature of evil arose directly men sought to define " virtue," although the fact of evil had been recognised as existing. With Socrates, virtue was knowledge; Plato made it to consist in wisdom ; Aristotle said it was " the mean " in which the senses were held by a habit of mind. The Stoics regarded virtue as a rational life in accordance with the nature, *i.e.* with the universal law of the world. How, then, did the Greeks explain evil in man ? Their analysis of human nature found an irreconcilable dualism of sense

and reason, body and soul. So that Socrates taught that evil is *ignorance*, to be cast out by knowledge. Aristotle viewed it as a *discord* in which the senses are to be reduced by reason to artistic harmony; Stoicism regarded it as *folly* to be avoided by rational self-control; and neo-Platonism treated it as *sensuousness*, to be purged by ascetic discipline. " There was in Hellenic thought," says Dr. W. M. Ramsay,* " no real conception of sin. . . . The counsel which Hellenic philosophy gave to man, which it must give so long as it continued true to the Hellenic spirit, was, Be yourself; do not fall short of your true and perfect development." But the N.T. regarded moral evil in man not as vice or folly, but as sin against God. The distinctive teaching of the N.T. about the redemption of man was founded, as we have seen, upon the conviction of sin. The searching analysis of the earliest Christian writers traced evil back to the will. Moral evil was sin against God, it was human self-will set in opposition to the will of God, and could

* Art. " Religion of Greece," Hastings' *Dict. of Bible*, ext. vol.

only be removed by the atonement effected by and in Christ. Comparing the teaching of Paul and Seneca, Dr. Lightfoot says, " The Stoic, so long as he was true to the tenets of his school, could have no real consciousness of sin. . . . With Seneca error or sin is running counter to the law of the universe. . . . He does not view it as an offence done to the will of an all-holy, all-righteous Being, an unfilial act of defiance towards a loving and gracious Father. . . . His pantheism had so obscured the personality of the Divine Being that reference [to sin] was, if not impossible, at least unnatural." *

The N.T., in making sin the act of the whole man expressed in will, made redemption to consist in the restoration of the complete personality. When the will is surrendered to God, the senses are brought into subjection to the divine law and the body sanctified so as to become a temple of the Holy Spirit. This view of human nature as it is and as it may be produced a type of Christian character in marked contrast to the Greek. The Hellenic wavered between the two poles of joyousness and

* *Epistle to the Philippians*, p. 296.

wisdom, but was marked throughout by independence. The Christian touches the extremes of humility and of confidence. "The peculiarly Christian virtue of humility," which, as Sidgwick says,* " presents a striking contrast to the Greek high-mindedness," was based upon a sense of dependence on God; so also saving faith, which, as Sidgwick further says, " gives the believer strength to attain, by God's supernatural aid or grace, a goodness of which he is naturally incapable " (p. 117).

5. The Individual and Society

A dual process can be seen at work in Greek speculation as to the relation of the individual to the community. The teaching of the Sophists, with their *homo mensura* standard, exalted individualism; the influence of Socrates also deepened the sense of personal freedom and responsibility. With the break-up of the Greek State, Greek thought turned from man as a member of the social organism and gave its attention to the satisfaction of individual needs. Stoicism and Epicureanism directed the

* *History of Ethics*, p. 124.

attention of men inwards to find in the individual life the standard of good—the former emphasising self-control and the latter self-gratification. And yet, side by side with this movement, there was growing or evolving a consciousness of the collective life that is not fully harmonised with individualism in any of the Greek thinkers. Even to understand man, Plato had first to examine the ideal Republic whose control over the individual he would fain make supreme. With Aristotle, ethics were secondary to political philosophy. Man is social, and "the individual is practically subordinated to the State; for the chief good of the one is the chief good of the other, and the State, as being the greater of the two, has the paramount interest" (W. L. Davidson). This organic view of the State regarded man as unable to be fully man except in a social order. When, under stress of external circumstances, the supremacy of the State taught by Plato and Aristotle broke down, the individualism of Epicureanism and Stoicism was to some extent counteracted by the recognition of the social relationship of personality. Among the

Epicureans it took the narrower form of friendship. Stoics had to recognise the social element in man as a rational being. The very freedom which the individual had in virtue of his rational nature involved a relation to his fellow-men as rational beings. "All must feel themselves portions of one connected whole. Man must not live for himself, but for socety" (Zeller). This social instinct found expression in cosmopolitanism. The Stoic regarded himself as a citizen of the world. This sentiment approaches the Christian ideal of universal brotherhood, and in some measure prepared the way for its adoption.

But the N.T. teaching is similar to the Stoic only in language and imagery. The relation of man with man in the Greek State, or later under the Roman Empire, was largely one of external constraint. The unity obtained was mechanical. But according to the N.T., man may be related to man in a union that is vital.

The cosmopolitanism of the Stoics was based upon man's possession of reason; the brotherhood of the N.T. was founded upon all being partakers of a spiritual nature

and all being children of God. The exercise
of reason (which united men to one another,
according to the Stoics) was only the privi-
lege of the few—the wise men—who alone
attained to a consciousness of universal
relationship with humanity. But partici-
pation in the brotherhood of the Christians
was due to the moral and spiritual quality of
love which the humblest and weakest might
exercise and share. The abstract concep-
tions of the Stoics had no living personal
power with which to unite men vitally,
whereas in the N.T. Christ is made the
federal head of mankind, joining all in one
living body.

The Stoic said, "Virtue is barred to
none; receives all, she invites all—gentle-
folk, freedmen, slaves, kings, exiles alike."
The Christian declared, "There is neither
Greek nor Jew; there is neither bond nor
free; there is no male or female; for ye
are all one in Christ Jesus." The Stoic
said, "I am a citizen of the world"; the
Christian said, "Our citizenship is in heaven.
God raised and seated us with Him in the
heavenly places in Christ Jesus." As Light-
foot remarks, "The magic words ἐν Χριστῷ

have produced the change and realised the conception " of universal brotherhood. The N.T. does full justice to the individual, making him an end in himself, and yet by its principle of love it makes men members one of another. The social implications of the ideas of both Kingdom and Church make it impossible for the Christian to regard his life as merely self-centred. The principle of love is Christo-centric, and as such harmonises both the individual and social aspects of personality. Although the N.T. affords no political or social teaching for the organising of a state or nation, it enunciates principles which will ensure both the freedom of the unit and the well-being of Society ; it furnishes ideals which can only be realised by the individual in the service of the many.

All the differences which the Greek conceptions of human personality present to those of the N.T. spring from their metaphysical presuppositions. The Hellenic theology was either polytheistic or pantheistic. In its later developments God was rather viewed as impersonal intelligence. The N.T. teaches that God is one and personal. Its theology—summarised in the two state-

ments " God is Spirit " and " God is Love "— affords human personality a sure ground for faith in its redemption from evil and for the hope of its future existence and consummation. Neo-Platonism involved the suppression of both intellect and the senses that man might be united with the Divine in an ecstasy wherein all self-consciousness is lost in the Absolute. But the N.T. teaches that man attains to fullest self-consciousness in communion with the Divine, and that, in the future life, finite man is not absorbed into the Infinite, but maintains his personality in living and conscious fellowship with God.

CHAPTER XIV

THE RELATION OF THE CHRISTIAN
IDEA TO MODERN THEORIES

IN concluding we may briefly inquire in
what relation the N.T. idea stands to
modern conceptions of human personality.
In the foregoing sections the attempt has
been made to show how within the N.T.
itself there is internal evidence to prove that
the life and personal influence of Jesus was
the great factor in giving due significance to
the worth of human nature; that his teach-
ing about God and man enlarged all hitherto
existing conceptions about each and their
relation to one another; and that the beliefs
about the meaning of his death and resur-
rection lifted man into a realm of ideas about
his own nature, his spiritual possibilities and
destiny, that surpassed all ancient beliefs
or speculations. Belief in the Incarnation

and Atonement, however variously expressed, placed man in a new perspective in his estimate of himself and of his relations both to God and to other men. While the N.T. viewed man wholly in his religious and ethical relations, it also gave him fresh views as to what he is in himself. The N.T. also mirrors man undergoing change in the realm of life and conduct—" Personality here becomes the channel through which a higher world is revealed " (Eucken).

In the first century A.D. there was not merely a profound modification of ideas concerning man ; there was also a transformation of human nature itself. The N.T. witnesses both to the subjective and objective change. And further, we have seen that by studying these facts side by side with the N.T. use of psychological terms, it has been possible to understand the new content that Christianity poured into old forms of thought drawn from both Hebraic and Hellenic sources. By this genetic method we have seen experience reacting upon terminology and thought reacting upon life in a continuous development, reflected in a literature that covers the first

century of Christian history. " Man's personality was being actually developed. It was becoming deeper and more intense. A new type was appearing and attempting to explain itself as it appeared " (Illingworth).

Succeeding centuries down to our own day have seen reproduced under different conditions the same transformation of human personality in the realm of experience. New depths of spiritual life have opened up within the individual, moralising influences have been at work in communities of men. The N.T. ideal of manhood has been realising itself, and through many forms of national and political life the N.T. ideal of society has sought embodiment. Thus a movement which gave the N.T. literature birth, and whose initial stages of growth are recorded in its writings, has gone on gathering depth and force, till to-day human personality is recognised as possessing a worth which no material goods can outweigh, as having claims and rights that demand both justice and love. The social problem that weighs so heavily upon the modern conscience is at bottom the problem of the individual. How

shall man become truly man ? is the question that presses for an answer. Never in the world was there such a sense of justice, and never were philanthropic and humanitarian projects so actively prosecuted; yet the consciousness is growing that "man is not man as yet." And it can hardly be denied that the N.T. teaching regarding man, its principles of love and its ethical precepts, are important factors in the creation and deepening of the modern consciousness of the value and rights of human personality.

But human personality is not only a fact that in its spiritual developments challenges our attention, and that in the realm of human affairs claims our most practical consideration—it is also a philosophic conception, a category of thought that has a history and that to-day occupies a commanding place in the world of reflection. Have the psychological and theological ideas which are found scattered throughout the N.T. and which nowhere there crystallise into a doctrine of personality—have these ideas contributed anything to the modern conception ? It is not sufficient to answer that " Christ gave philosophy a new world

to discover," * although it may well be claimed that the spiritual experiences recorded in the N.T. do afford psychological data for a just estimate of the possibilities of human nature and for a fuller philosophical conception of personality. The question is, what aspect, if any, in our present-day category of personality may be traced to the N.T. and its teachings about man ?

In philosophy the principle has a significance that is metaphysical, or ethical, or psychological, according as we may view it. Into the purely psychological aspect of the question we are not called upon to enter here.   The N.T. has contributed largely, though for the most part indirectly, to the discussion of the metaphysical aspects of personality.   The formulation of the theological doctrines of the Trinity, and the attempt to define the nature of Christ, raised metaphysical problems, as to what we mean by the term " person," which successively occupied the attention of Tertullian, Augustine, and Aquinas, until in modern times the

* Rowlands, art. " Personality," *Dict. of Christ and the Gospels*.

20

philosophic interest of the question became centred in human personality. But in the meantime, the element of individuality in human personality had been brought to light. The discussions concerning immortality which the N.T. raised contributed the idea of the continuity and identity of the Ego. The relation of Christian Theism to Pantheism was further discussed, to the enrichment of the idea of human personality. The N.T. in all these questions was provocative of discussion that raised ultimate metaphysical problems that helped to elucidate the nature of man himself. But it was to the ethical significance of the conception that the N.T. mostly contributed. The Biblical view of human nature makes the will central. While the O.T. views it rather as something to be disciplined into conformity to the will of God revealed in moral codes, the N.T. teaches that in surrender to God it may be transformed and reinforced by the gift of the Spirit. The O.T. by its appeal to the human conscience deepened the sense of responsibility ; the N.T. by its appeal to faith deepened the sense of freedom through willing obedience. The

Greek viewed man almost exclusively as a rational being who realised his true self in thought and contemplation. Aristotle had but little idea of the will as an element of personality, and consequently hardly any recognition of conscience is to be met with in his writings. But the Christian fastened on the moral nature in man as the essential part; for its renewal he proclaimed the gospel of redemption, for its outer regulation he prescribed the new righteousness of the Kingdom. The N.T. evangel and the N.T. ethic both appealed to conscience first of all, that they might bring the will of man into harmony with the divine will.

In Kant two streams meet—the Greek exaltation of *intellect* finding recognition in the "theoretical reason," and the N.T. insistence on *conscience* finding expression in the "practical reason"—and thenceforward the unity of self-consciousness and of self-determination became the foundation of all satisfying conceptions of human personality.

Since the days of Kant three main tendencies of thought in regard to personality may be noted as bearing upon the N.T. teaching concerning man.

1. Materialism, with its naturalistic views of man, regards him as a part of, a product of, the external world. It uses a psychological analysis which emphasises states of consciousness as objects for observation and as the psychical results or concomitants of physical processes. In the metaphysical implications of materialism man is subordinated to external necessity and deprived of that freedom which is the essence of personality. A selfish individualism is the outcome of such a theory. Just as Epicureanism in ancient times was based upon the materialistic speculations of Democritus, so in modern times Hedonism in some form or another is the ethical theory logically adopted by materialistic writers. When man is viewed in his social relations, a Universalistic Hedonism would minimise the significance of personality by introducing the idea of the claims of the social organism as the ultimate grounds of duty. Whether naturalism appears as a crude materialism or seeks by some agnostic theory of epiphenominalism or psycho-physical parallelism to mitigate the harsher aspects of its theory, it endangers human personality by sub-

jugating him to the external necessity of physical causality and to the external constraint of organised society. Man generally draws within himself and seeks some subjective good in his reaction against the supposed determinism of natural law or the tyranny of human government. Self-centred individualism flourished under the materialistic philosophy of Lucretius and the iron rule of the Roman empire. Although Epicureanism and Stoicism paved the way to a recognition of the rights of sense and of reason respectively in the life of each man, and though Roman law guarded the privileges of individuality in the matters of legal rights, yet man did not rise under these conditions to the sense of his true personality, and never can, while external necessity overshadows the possibility of an adequate self-realisation.

The scepticism of Hume, who confessed his difficulty in finding a self behind the fleeting sensations and states of consciousness, roused Kant from his dogmatic slumber to make a critical examination of the human mind. The positive result of Kant's inquiry was to establish the fact that man not

merely experiences states of consciousness, but personality involves a consciousness of psychic states. This synthetic unity of consciousness is the stronghold within personality against naturalistic philosophy. Kant's doctrine of " the thing-in-itself " has given a loophole for agnosticism to introduce doubt as to man's spiritual autonomy; but the movement of thought initiated by Kant, which recognises both the moral and rational claims of the self to freedom, continues to strengthen the view of personality which is reflected in the N.T., viz. that man is active will, morally responsible and spiritually free, and yet a vehicle for the fulfilment of the will of God in whose image he was created and whose divine purposes become the end of all his moral action. Against all theories of mechanical causality and determinism, the N.T. conception of the spirituality and rational will of God allies itself with theistic idealism.

2. Absolutism,* an opposite tendency of thought to materialism, endangers human personality by over-emphasis of the very idealism which should guard it. If material-

* As in Bradley's *Appearance and Reality*.

ism ·and agnosticism attack personality
with weapons drawn from the world of
external nature, absolute idealism is the
enemy within the camp which turns the
intellectual weapons of man's defence
against himself to his own destruction.
Naturalism would reduce man to captivity
to the laws of the physical world. Abso-
lutism brings personality into bondage to
the laws of the logical intellect. The former
would crush personality by impersonal na-
ture, the latter would drown him in the
ocean of impersonal thought. Spencer re-
gards the self as a mere phenomenon appear-
ing to the consciousness of man ; Bradley
makes the self a phenomenon within the
eternal consciousness of the Absolute. Ma-
terialistic analysis disintegrates conscious-
ness into its changing states, but idealistic
speculation dissolves the finite consciousness
into the Universal Mind. And so we see
extremes of thought meeting to pronounce
and execute doom upon the personality of
man. Descartes in the seventeenth cen-
tury had laid the foundation for a true
conception of personality by finding in self-
conscious thought the characteristic feature

of all human experience. His "*cogito ergo sum*" affirmed that the doubt which a man might have about his own existence proved that he existed. Being and consciousness in man set him in opposition to the objective world. But the gulf between thought and things this pioneer of modern philosophy was unable to bridge, and his unresolved dualism brought Spinoza into the field with his category of "substance," and in avoiding dualism he substituted pantheism. When Kant had asserted the sovereign rights of consciousness, Hegel took up the problem, and for Spinoza's universal "substance" substituted "universal spirit" as the ultimate category of explanation.

Hegelian idealism has been an effective weapon against materialism, but it cannot be questioned that in its later development, as absolute idealism, it has menaced individuality and freedom, which are fundamental elements in any adequate view of human personality. Self-consciousness becomes in many neo-Hegelians the mere form of personality. "The essence of a person," says Dr. Rashdall (*Personal Idealism*, p. 382), " is not what he is for another,

but what he is for himself. It is there that his *principium individuationis* is to be found—in what he is when looked at from the inside. All the fallacies of our anti-individualist thinkers come from talking as though the essence of a person lay in what can be known about him and not in his own knowledge, his own experience of himself. And that, in turn, arises largely from the assumption that knowledge, without feeling or will, is the whole of reality."

In Green and the Cairds it is often impossible to discover whether, in speaking of thought or consciousness, they are speaking of the human or the divine. The presence of God in the process of the world's development and in human experience is so exclusively immanent that the self is merged in a panlogism that threatens to be as inimical to the individuality of man as pantheism. The danger of Hegelian absolutism to personal freedom by the identification of the self with the character has been pointed by Prof. James Seth, who says, " The only way to save freedom would seem to be by maintaining the distinction between the self and the charac-

ter, not in the absolute or Kantian sense, but in the sense that while the self is what in its character it appears to be, it yet is always more than any such empirical manifestation of it; that while it is immanent in its experience, it also for ever transcends that experience." *

The extreme intellectualism so characteristic of the followers of Hegel is a result of over-emphasis on one element in personality, and here again the N.T. ideas of man and his relation to God are a continual corrective to such excess. The individuality and freedom of man on the one side, and the transcendence of a personal God on the other, are two truths upon which Christianity stands in opposition to all pantheistic tendencies of human speculation. The N.T. teaches also the immanence of God and the dependence of man. The two views of God and man respectively can never be harmonised in thought unless the will is recognised as the essential factor, though not the only factor, in personality. A modern reaction against absolutism has

---

* *Ethical Principles*, p. 390 ; *cf.* also J. Seth, *Hegelianism and Personality*, pp. 157-224.

called forth a third movement of thought in which the volitional element in personality is made prominent.

3. Pragmatism is a term used especially in connection with the metaphysical theories of James.   But it may also be conveniently used to cover all philosophical theories in recent times which try to do justice to the active side of human personality.   In theology the revolt against metaphysical excess found expression in the writings of Ritschl and his followers.   A parallel movement has gone on in philosophy.   Its extremest form appears in Schopenhauer, who, in making irrational will the ultimate principle of thought, paved the way for pessimism and for Hartmann's theory of the unconscious, which fail as signally to do justice to personality as the speculations against which they are a protest.   Lotze, while maintaining that feeling is the primary basis of personality,* is compelled, in the case of the Divine Personality, to presuppose an act of will to produce the feelings in Himself. " For the infinite Spirit," he says (*Philoophy of Religion*, p. 70), " all these contents,

* *Microcosmus*, vol. ii. p. 69.

which in our own case, though primarily coming from stimuli coming from without, yet come to be matter of æsthetic and moral judgment, would probably be productions of His own creative fantasy, and His personality would consist in being the subject which feels in this worth or worthlessness of what is so produced." Höffding, on the other hand, recognises that no one element in conscious and self-conscious life is adequate as an explanation of the whole. " Personality," he says (*Problems of Philosophy*, p. 3), " consists pre-eminently in the inner unity and connection of all our ideas, feelings, and strivings." But when seeking for the fundamental idea in our concept of personality, he declares that it is the will. " The idea of will, taken in the broadest sense as the idea of psychical activity, appears as the fundamental idea " (p. 55).

The value of this recognition of the active side of man as of supreme importance in a true conception of personality is that it guards both the individuality and the freedom of man. But the dangers to which excessive emphasis on will, to the disparagement of thought, exposes pragmatism, is

apparent in the writings of James and Schiller. The Divine Personality is broken up into a pluralism that undermines the essential thought of the unity of God, and brings us back to polytheism. While pragmatism contends legitimately for the individuality of man, it runs into extremes of individualism. In denying the absolute existence of truth and goodness, it introduces a thorough-going utilitarianism into moral theory. The irrationalism of pragmatist-philosophy takes from man an essential part of his personality, as does the intellectualism which it attempts to refute.

The protest of voluntarism against all-engulfing absolutism has been a necessary one, and is a demand for the emotional and volitional aspects of man that are prominent in all Christian conceptions of human nature.

The N.T. ideas of personality gather round man's moral and spiritual nature, as the essential core of his being. The Divine Spirit goes forth in creation and again in redemption, giving effect to God's wise and saving purposes. The human spirit is the God-given principle of life and spring of conduct within him, and when the moral

nature of man is willingly given up to the divine, the power of God's goodness is imparted to man and becomes in him holiness of life and character.

The conviction is gaining ground that no one psychical element in the complex nature of man can be used to explain the fulness of meaning contained in the category of personality. The attempt to find a wider synthesis has been made by Eucken in his philosophy of activism. The religious side of idealism is warmly advocated in his writings. He holds that " the possibility of identification of our humanity with the all-powerful Spirit can be established only through the fact of its realisation." * The N.T. ideas of human personality show that they harmonise with those modern conceptions of human personality which on the side of self-consciousness emphasise the unity, continuity, and identity of each man's life, and which on the side of self-determination regard him as free and responsible. But the distinctive feature in the Christian idea of personality is that the whole

* *The Struggle for a Concrete Spiritual Experience,* p. 293.

man—emotional, thinking, and willing—
stands in closest and most intimate relation-
ship with the Divine Spirit, from whence he
originated and under whose personal in-
fluence and power he alone reaches his
consummation in Christ.

INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL PASSAGES

OLD TESTAMENT

NEW TESTAMENT

GENERAL INDEX

Trichotomy, 49 f., 66 f.
Tylor, 260

Understanding, 78, 90 ff.
— and heart, 90–95

Volition, 20, 57

Weinel, 168, 177 ff., 184
Weiss (B.), 59 f.
Weizsäcker, 172–175
Wendt, 121, 129
Wernle, 116 f., 176
Will, 19 f., 78

Zeller, 282, 236, 207

DATE DUE